The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1896.

The Week.

THE reference in the Queen's speech to the Venezuelan difficulty is pacific enough. Parliament is informed that the Government of the United States have "expressed a wish to coöperate in bringing to a close" the Guiana boundary dispute, and that "I have expressed my sympathy with the desire to come to an equitable arrangement." This seems to give ample confirmation to the rumors that negotiations have been going on between Washington and London since the bellicose message of December 17, and have been much more amicable in tone. Certainly no ministry could describe the Olney-Cleveland threat to settle the whole thing ourselves as the expression of "a wish to coöperate." It must be, then, that our Washington fire-eaters, after their theatric display, went quietly back to the methods of Evarts and Frelinghuysen and Bayard and Blaine and Gresham, and tried the effect of good offices instead of bludgeons. This will be hailed as good news on both sides the Atlantic, and all will hope, with the Queen's speech, that "further negotiations will lead to a satisfactory settlement."

The speeches of Mr. Balfour and Lord Salisbury, as well as those of Sir William Harcourt and Lord Rosebery, following the Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament, further indicate that the Venezuela controversy is in a fair way of peaceable settlement. The sense of the English nation, like that of the American people, is clearly against even the thought of the possibility of war between Great Britain and the United States. Mr. Balfour reiterated in the Commons his hope that out of the late evil the great good may come of a permanent arbitration agreement between the two countries. Certainly this is the auspicious time to strike for such a consummation; and the Washington authorities cannot bring forth works more meet for repentance than a hearty closing with any and every advance made to them along this line. Mr. Olney's extremely polite and gracious note of February 3, though a little late, was received with equal graciousness; and nothing seems now to remain except an exchange of compliments and a speedy adjustment of the whole miserable Venezuelan dispute, with our Commission probably, and to their own great satisfaction, left high and dry to one side. Of far greater interest to Parliament and the British nation is the Turkish situation. All Lord Salisbury's skill in dialectics cannot save him from the appearance of having suffered a great diplomatic defeat in this affair.

President Washburn of Robert College, Constantinople, has an interesting article in last week's *Independent* on the Armenian deadlock. He seems to be convinced that Salisbury could not have done any more than he has done without imminent danger of bringing on a European war. That danger President Washburn thinks should have been faced with "faith in God and the Right." But that, on merely political and statesmanlike grounds, Salisbury could not have gone forward without the Powers at his back, appears to be admitted. When he has threatened, or intimated, as he did last summer, armed intervention, he meant intervention, perhaps by England alone, but with the consent and moral support of the Powers always understood. Mr. Washburn is fair and frank enough to concede that the "difficulty with the United States" must have hampered Lord Salisbury enormously. The depression which our brief war madness of December last wrought in thoughtful Americans living abroad is well expressed by the President of the American college in Constantinople, when he says:

> "The present hope of the world is in America; but we have more reason to fear than to boast. I know both countries very well, and I should not like to say that the standard of morality and Christian living is any higher in America than in England, or that the worship of Mammon is more frantic in London than in Chicago, or that our courts administer justice more fairly and surely than hers, or that our moneyed aristocracy is of purer morals or more unselfish spirit than her hereditary nobility. But as a nation we have made no final choice of evil. I thought we had a month ago when I read the President's message, and heard of the enthusiastic cheers which went up all over the land at the prospect of war. I am glad to believe that I was mistaken, that the President did not mean what he seemed to say, and that the cheers for war were only an unhappy way of expressing our patriotism."

The *Rio News* has some striking and truthful remarks about the total confusion of mind of many of our public men, with Secretary Olney at their head, in regard to what we ought to think of South American institutions, and what South Americans themselves really think of us. The power of words to mislead mankind was never more conspicuously shown than by the effect on the imagination of the term "republic" chosen to describe governments which are truly, for the most part, nothing but military oligarchies. England, a republic in everything but name, we must hate as the home of "alien institutions," but South American governments, which are republican in nothing but name, we must hail as sisters on the strength of what we call them, not what they actually are. Equally factitious is the idea that the South Americans have any especial fondness for us, either as republicans or human beings. The *Rio News* tells the exact truth on this point; and so does the Buenos Ayres *Herald* when it affirms that the Argentines are of "a different race, of different language, customs, and interests, having no sympathy with American thought or commerce, having neither affection nor any especial friendship for Americans." Ah, but these are the opinions of jealous foreigners, violently suspected of having their pockets filled with British gold. Not at all. Both the *News* and *Herald* are edited by Americans—only they happen to be Americans who have lived long in the countries they write of, keep their eyes open, and speak the thing they think, unaffected by the fumes either of a Presidential ambition or of the after-dinner wine-cup too long looked upon.

It appears that the advocates of the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as States have about half of the House committee on Territories on their side, and are hopeful of pushing the scheme through Congress at this session. Public sentiment ought to pronounce so emphatically against this proposition that Congress will drop it. Neither of the two Territories is fit for statehood. The only effect of admitting them will be to strengthen the champions of every financial folly by four more votes in the Senate. Sound-money Representatives and Senators ought to be notified that their constituents will not pardon them if they help to consummate such an outrage.

There is a sort of poetic justice in the action of the Senators from the silver-mining States who have voted to substitute a free-coinage bill in place of the House tariff bill. Those States were admitted to the Union for the express purpose of keeping the Republicans in control of the Senate and of preserving the blessed tariff. Both of these dishonest aims have failed, but the republic has received no detriment in consequence. The House tariff bill is a bill of false pretences from beginning to end. It was not expected to become a law when it was passed in the House, but merely to commit the party to passing it at some future time when the party should be strong enough to shape legislation at its own pleasure. The silver extremists have said, through Senators Teller and Jones, that in any such game they hold the winning cards. The country is much benefited by non-action at the present time on the tariff as well as on the silver question. It would be even more benefited if Congress would adjourn as soon as the necessary appropriation bills can be passed. But if it is to remain in session for purposes of general legislation, it can do nothing less harmful than to substitute a free-silver bill for the tariff bill and then kill the former.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The address of Mr. Wharton Barker to the manufacturers on the subject of silver and the tariff is not a very weighty document. It amounts to saying that there will be no more protective-tariff bills passed unless the free coinage of silver is made a part of the measure. But this threat carries no terrors to any manufacturers who are satisfied with the present tariff, and we have heard of no movement for increased duties except among the Ohio wool-growers, who are hardly to be classed as manufacturers. Accompanying Mr. Barker's manifesto is a paper signed by sixteen Republican Senators (all of them, except Cameron, from States west of the Missouri River), saying that they favor rescuing the people of the United States from the impending danger of being overwhelmed by the industrial competition of China and Japan, "by removing the difference of exchange between gold-standard countries and silver-standard countries by the only method possible, which is the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the independent action of the United States." This is not exactly the same thing in terms as Mr. Barker's pronunciamiento, but it probably means the same thing. If so, it means that the House tariff bill will not pass the Senate at this session of Congress, and probably not at any session. Yet it is possible that the manufacturers may not tremble.

We are glad to record the practical defeat of the movement in the Senate to divide up the appropriation bills among a lot of committees, instead of giving the control of nearly all of them to a single committee. The object of this attempt to destroy a centralized and responsible oversight of the national expenditures was scarcely concealed. Much fine talk was put forward about the need of relieving the committee on appropriations from a part of its arduous labors, and of securing more deliberate consideration for important bills; but behind all this was an evident plan, both to increase the power of other committees and other chairmanships, and to make raids on the Treasury easier of execution. The very character of the men engineering the affair was enough to make it extremely suspicious; and though they began with great confidence and with an apparent large majority of the Senate, the sober sense of the older members, together with a little manœuvring of their own, appears to have squelched the whole scheme. It would surely be a pity to abandon one of our few remaining checks on reckless and extravagant legislation, and to make our system of voting money in and out of the Treasury still more chaotic than it is.

Senator Lodge's $100,000,000 bill for coast defences, about which he has been so long mewing and caterwauling on our roofs, was stranded worse than the steamer *St. Paul*, on Saturday week, and will not be got afloat again so easily, we think. He had his scheme nicely prepared and printed, to be offered as an amendment to the House bond bill. It proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to the amount of $100,000,000, drawing interest at 3 per cent., the principal payable twenty years from date in "coin," with an annual sinking fund of $3,000,000, the proceeds of the bonds to be kept in a separate fund and applied solely to the fortification of the seacoast and lakes of the United States, for the manufacture of guns, the purchase of sites, and the erection of forts and batteries according to plans to be hereafter prepared by the War Department. When this amendment was offered, Senator Teller moved to lay it on the table. Mr. Lodge called for the yeas and nays. To order the yeas and nays a vote of one fifth of the Senators present is required. Only three or four votes were cast for this motion. Senator Teller's motion to lay on the table then prevailed without a division.

The debate in the House on Thursday showed that the silver element among the Republicans in the lower branch of Congress is as bent on declaring itself as is the case with Republican Senators who believe in free coinage. Mr. Johnson of California openly and strongly denounced the Reed programme of inaction. He declared that "a do-nothing policy, or a policy confined to action on non-essentials, such as self-constituted leaders of the House say is proper, will not serve," and he criticised Chairman Dingley of the ways and means committee for offering nothing as an alternative to free coinage, urging that at least provision be made for the coining of American silver. "The silver Republicans," he announced, "are ready to set lance in rest now or at any time upon this question." In taking this position Mr. Johnson, and the silver Republicans who stand with him, feel that they have their constituents behind them. Upon the passage by the Senate of the free-coinage substitute for the bond bill, the Denver *Republican* declared that "the Republican majority in the House ought to have sufficient intelligence and patriotism to pass the bill exactly as it went through the Senate." Although it is generally assumed that there is a "goldite" majority in the House, the *Republican* questioned the correctness of that conclusion, and wanted to see a fair test made in order that every member may be forced to go on record. It expected that Speaker Reed and the Republican members who favor his Presidential aspirations would attempt to smother the measure in committee or elsewhere, but insisted that this should not be permitted, but that the bill should be forced to a vote on its merits, "in spite of the opposition of possible Presidential candidates, and the jugglery of two-faced representatives who profess to be bimetallists at home and act as the tools of the Money Power in Washington."

A significant speech was delivered in the House on Saturday by Mr. Hall, a Democratic Representative from Missouri, who has hitherto been a strong free-coinage man, but now declares his conversion to the cause of sound money. Mr. Hall made the interesting statement that eight of the Senators who voted for free coinage a few days ago have said privately that they believe the adoption of this policy would destroy the commercial prosperity of the country. This is entirely credible; indeed, nobody has ever been able to believe that all, or a large proportion, of the Senators who have voted for free coinage were such fools as to believe in it. It is impossible, for example, to suppose that such a man as Wolcott of Colorado seriously thinks that the prosperity of the United States would be promoted by the adoption of this policy; but he knew that anybody who questioned its wisdom would have stood no chance of being elected a Senator from Colorado. Many other Senators who voted on the same side have had less excuse for their attitude, since their constituents have no selfish interest in silver mines, and might have been shown the folly of the silver delusion if the public men whom they trusted had done their duty. One of the most striking signs of the decadence of the Senate is the readiness of its members to shirk responsibility, as evidenced by the willingness of many who believe that free coinage would ruin the nation to vote for it because they think it popular with their constituents, and leave the House of Representatives or the President to block a scheme that they ought to have defeated themselves.

People may freely speak their mind, as they are speaking it, about the wretched incapacity and recreancy of Congress in all matters of domestic legislation. Nothing is commoner than to hear the Senate, especially, denounced as a collection of knaves and imbeciles, a fearful incubus on the country which it totally misunderstands and misrepresents. The vast majority of the intelligent citizens of the nation would be indignant if told that they must not question the wisdom of Congress about the currency, about taxation, about copyright, about banking. What! that body of adventurers and trucklers represent the country? We must all "stand behind" it? Treason to talk against it? But, excited brother, is not this just what you were saying about the action of Congress on the vastly greater question of peace or war? Were you not almost ready to mob anybody who said that Congress was as ignorant and cowardly in that matter as you now admit it is in all others? It would be strange, indeed, if a Congress which has shown itself wholly incapable of laying taxes or ordering the currency,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should suddenly develop the loftiest patriotism and purest wisdom in a crisis affecting the very life of the nation. Men are not built that way. If they are trimmers or incendiaries in that which is least, they will be in that which is much. No one suddenly becomes wise and virtuous, any more than base. The men at Washington whom we now speak of with disgust and loathing, are the very men who, we were told six weeks ago, accurately represented the deliberate judgment of this nation. They were precisely the same men then that they are now, and they trifled with the vast issues of peace and war, with the very destiny of the country, in the same reckless and barbaric spirit which they now display in dealing with the national credit. They did not put more character or intelligence into that work than they are putting into this, though in the frenzy of the moment they passed as wise patriots. Luckily, that frenzy is now overpassed, and thousands of shamefaced people are ready to admit that their worshipped heroes of last December were really the same ignoble and incapable set that they now despise.

That the proper study of mankind is war is maintained with great power in the last *North American Review* by Capt. H. C. Taylor of the Naval War College. He is pained at the widespread "prejudice against its study," admits with shame that "soldiers and sailors hardened in battle" have called war "unnatural," just as if they were no clearer-eyed than "philosophers of a certain ability," and points out that the ravages of "the anti-war spirit during the nineteenth century" have gone to such an alarming extent that some men can "soberly suggest the possibilities of the nations of the earth ceasing to war with each other." Against such a horrible thought he lifts a manly voice. War, he maintains, is necessary to the whole man—to "the artistic spirit," to "the moral nature," to "the fervor of religion." It is a serious mistake to think of Christ as the great non-resistant; for "the willing effacement of the stubborn ego in the flood of fellow-humanity which the head of Christianity demands," is possible through war alone. The duty of a Christian nation, mindful of "the dignity of her high estate," is clearly, therefore, to keep fighting as constantly as possible, so that we may retain "the idea of war as a permanent factor of life," and prevent peace from "generating doubts as to the wisdom of the Providence that sways the universe." All this makes the plan of salvation plain and beautiful, but Capt. Taylor seems to confuse matters by a weak admission that "war is cruel and brutal, disposing men to a state of savagery." We do not see that he saves himself by adding that "the corrupt ease, the luxurious immorality of life, towards which a total absence of war always leads nations, has in it something more degrading for the human race than simple savagery." If war makes us savages, and the absence of war something worse than savages, it would seem to be all up with us. But it must be confessed that Capt. Taylor's thesis that war disposes men to a state of savagery, he certainly proves in his own person.

The last New York Legislature passed an act which places the 12th of February, the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, on the same footing as New Year's, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. The States of New Jersey, Illinois, and Washington have taken similar action, while Connecticut has established a Lincoln holiday in the month of October. It is a mistaken policy. A general observance of two holidays within ten days of each other in February is impossible, while the Connecticut idea of picking out a day that has no relation to any event in Lincoln's life is absurd. The consequence must be that the anniversary will secure but small recognition, while it introduces a fresh disturbance of business. Lincoln himself, with his shrewd common sense, would have put a quietus on the suggestion if he could have had his way about it. The mischief is that, as revolutions do not go backward, holidays are not revoked, and that the granting of them seems as easy to procure, and as difficult for legislators to resist, as the generality of demagogical measures.

John Morley gave a definition of the Jingo, in his speech at Arbroath the other night, which has a philosophical neatness and accuracy about it. He rightly said that your Jingo is known to the fauna of all countries, infesting Great Britain as well as America. The "born Jingo," said Mr. Morley, evidently having in mind the many artificial, for-this-campaign-only Jingoes, is "a man overflowing with the old Adam of violence and force, who would not be a bad fellow if he could only recognize two things—first, that there is a relation between cause and effect, and, second, that there is a difference between right and wrong." It is almost cruel now to recall the aptness with which our Jingoes have lately illustrated the definition. To shriek for war one day and bewail a smashed stock market and chilled business the next, could be possible only in beings of a deficient sense of causal relations. Great Heavens, they said, we never meant that! But godlike reason is given to mortals precisely that they may foresee the consequences of their own acts. The difference between right and wrong is a subtler thing, which bluff Jingo minds perhaps ought not to be expected to grasp on all occasions; but even they ought to find it incredible that we should always be right, and the other fellows always wrong, and that, anyhow, we can whip them.

The Anglo-French convention, signed January 15, relating to Siam, appears to have given satisfaction on both sides of the Channel. Its effect is not so much to partition Siam as to determine the respective English and French "spheres of influence," and to neutralize the Menam valley—say, one-third of the entire territory of Siam. In this region each country will enjoy the same commercial rights, and Lord Salisbury made it clear in his letter to the Marquis of Dufferin, that he did not doubt the ability of English merchants and traders to compete with the French on even terms. No one seems to have inquired how the Siamese would like the arrangement. It was apparently thought superfluous to question Siam's perfect willingness to be cut up into spheres of influence and neutralized regions. Anyhow, it is now reported that the Siamese authorities are quite content. They may be making a virtue of necessity, or reflecting how much worse it might have been.

Protection, masquerading as hygienic regulations, is taking a novel turn in Germany. The demand is made that Russian grain be excluded on the ground that it is a deadly vehicle of infection. A professor has found in one-tenth of a gramme of Russian oats, barley, and rye, anywhere from 500,000 to 1,000,000 bacilli, and from 400 to 12,000 mould fungi. This is enough for Count Kanitz and the Agrarians, who are loudly demanding that the national health (not, of course, their farm products) be protected against the new danger. Meanwhile, it is safe to say that all attempts of bacteriologists to put German grain under the microscope will be severely frowned upon. Such a thing, on a pinch, could be made out *lèse-majesté*.

What a serious business the trade of Emperor has become in the modern world may be inferred from some statistics recently published in the German papers regarding William II.'s distribution of his time during the past year. He spent 159 days away from Berlin. Of these, 52 were taken up by hunting parties, 38 by visits to allied princes, and 28 by military parades and army manœuvres—what has been called the "defilirium tremens" of the Kaiser. The remaining days of his absence from the capital were passed in different German cities, haranguing the burgomasters, and in various royal châteaus, doing "suthin' in the pastoral line." Even when in Berlin, William keeps up his pathological activity, counting that day lost whose low descending sun has not seen a garrison alarmed, a minister rebuked, Socialists threatened with the sword of the Lord's anointed, or an imperial finger thrust into some international pie. To such a life a young man must feel that he has a "serious call" before daring to undertake it in this degenerate age.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOND SALE.

THE success of the new Government loan has surpassed the expectations of everybody, in both the amount offered and the price obtained. The oldest and most experienced heads in Wall Street were as much astonished as the neophytes. The whole amount subscribed for was in excess of $500;000,000. This casts in the shade everything else previously attempted. The loan of February, 1894, was practically forced upon the New York city banks after the public had failed to subscribe. The 5 per cent. bonds it offered were taken at 117.223, a rate which made the interest equal to 3 per cent. The purchasers lost money on them. The loan of November, 1894, was of the same kind, and the results were the same. The syndicate loan of February, 1895, was a sale of 4 per cents at 104.50, which made the interest equal to 3¾ per cent. The present bids averaging about 111, the rate of interest will be about 3⅜, which is more favorable to the Government than the syndicate loan of last February, but not so favorable as the loan of February, 1894. Nor must we fail to remark that the credit of New York city is higher than that of the United States. On the 26th of February last year, $3.265,000 city bonds sold above par, the bids ranging as high as 103.25. These were 3 per cents, but they were specifically payable in gold. This accounts for the solecism that the nation's credit is inferior to that of one of its cities which contains not more than a fortieth part of its population. If we look abroad for comparisons, we find that British consols bearing 2¾ per cent. interest are selling at 108⅛, or nearly as high as our 4 per cents. When the Government bond contract was pending in February, 1895, the syndicate offered to take the lot at a price equal to 3 per cent. if the loan were made payable in gold, but Congress refused to pass an act to that effect. It cannot be doubted that if such a law were now in force, the present sale would have been made on far better terms for the Government. The bid would probably have been as high as 125.

Of course this sale will be drawn into comparison with that of February, 1895, and to the disparagement of the latter. It should be borne in mind, however, that the syndicate contract was made at a time when the Government was within three days (some say three hours) of suspension. It was made in the very teeth of a panic. The Government came as a borrower at a time when ordinary borrowers could not get money on any terms. To have delayed thirty days then would have involved both public and private bankruptcy. Under circumstances of that appalling kind it was impossible to wait, and we think still that the offer at the time was a reasonable one, considering the syndicate's engagement to protect the Treasury gold reserve for ten months, and their actual protection of it for a year. It should be remembered, also, that the elections of last autumn, so disastrous to the silverites in parts of the country where they were supposed to be strong, have had an improving effect on the public credit, so that, barring any war scare, the bonds ought to sell higher now than then. If we make a further comparison with the recent offer of the Morgan syndicate to take $100,000,000 at 105, we must bear in mind that that offer was made in the shadow of a panic caused by Mr. Cleveland's Venezuelan message, which has since been measurably cleared away. On certain days after that message was sent to Congress, no bid could be obtained for Government bonds in Wall Street. Nobody could have anticipated then that there would be such a clearing up of the financial atmosphere within so short a time.

The effect of what has happened on the silverites must be blighting. When the business interests of the country come forward, at thirty days' notice, and offer to bet five hundred million dollars that the gold standard will be maintained, and to put up 20 per cent. of that sum as a pledge of good faith, the bragging and blackguardism of the silver majority in the Senate disappear like loose straw in a hurricane. It would be impossible to produce by any other means such a profound moral effect. It was only a few weeks ago that their chief men assembled in Washington and prepared a political programme for the Presidential year. They called a national convention to meet at St. Louis on the same day as that of the Populists. They declared it to be their purpose to compel one of the great political parties, if not both, to adopt a platform in favor of free coinage at the rate of 16 to 1, by this country alone, failing in which they would nominate a Presidential ticket and create a new party in all the States, based upon that single idea. They could have done nothing more gratifying to the friends of sound money. The strength of the silver faction all along has consisted in their ability to pose as a balance of power between Republicans and Democrats. In this way a minority as small as one-tenth may exercise a preponderating influence over a wide region of country and over national affairs, whereas if they should take the field as a separate force, relying on their own numbers and the merits of their particular scheme, they would win nothing but ridicule. This will be the situation of the silverites as soon as they begin a separate 16-to-1 campaign.

The "first gun" in this campaign has been fired. It is a far more telling shot than the numbers of the persons concerned would imply. Its force consists in the demonstration that the capital of the country is determined that the gold standard shall be maintained, is ready to put up, not $100,000,000 merely, but as much money as may be needed at any future time. The effect of such a demonstration upon political parties must be very great and very beneficial. It must also serve to brace up the financial nerve of the Administration if it needed any bracing, and it may lead to a still further accumulation of gold. Indeed, it would have been better if the loan had been for $200,000,000 instead of half that sum. With the gold now in hand, that would have given the Treasury a reserve of nearly $270,000,000, which is not too large for the total amount of fiat money outstanding. When the gold reserve was collected preparatory to specie resumption in 1878, it was about 30 per cent. of the legal-tender notes to be redeemed. Since that time we have added to the stock of fiat money, in round numbers, $400,000,000 of silver and $150,000,000 of Treasury notes, bringing the total up to $900,000,000. If 30 per cent. was the proper proportion of reserve to demand liabilities in 1879, it must be considered so now. In fact, that percentage is much smaller than is held by the great banks of Europe which are charged with the duty of keeping the ultimate gold reserve of their respective countries.

It may be said that the $100,000,000 of greenbacks now in the Treasury vaults should be deducted from the total amount of fiat money. It is true that as long as they remain there they cannot be used to draw gold from the Treasury, but, since they are liable to be paid out in consequence of any excessive appropriations by Congress, and must be so paid if, for any reason, the Government's expenses exceed its receipts, they cannot be ignored. They are liable to be rushed into the circulation at any time, and hence, in any prudent calculation of the future, must be considered as a part of the nation's demand liabilities. The $110,000,000 or more of gold to be realized from the new bond sale, added to the stock in hand previously, will carry us to the end of the present year, without any commotion resulting from financial causes; but if the reserve should fall below the traditional $100,000,000 at any time during the term of the present Secretary, he will be justified by public opinion in making a new loan equal to the present one, which would be large enough to constitute a permanent infallible reserve, needing no further additions and dispensing with all further anxiety.

NATIONAL INSANITY.

THERE is a story told of Bishop Butler, the author of the 'Analogy,' that, walking in his garden one night with his chaplain, he asked him whether "public bodies might not go mad as well as individuals," adding that "nothing else could account for most of the transactions in history." The question is an exceedingly interesting one, and seems to grow more so with the passage of time and the increase of intellectual activity; and yet there has been but little discussion of it by either historians or alienists. For instance, if we were to examine Socialism—or rather the various schemes which are laid before

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world under that name—with the aid of tests and standards which a professional alienist applies to signs of mental disease in individuals, it would be almost impossible to avoid placing it in the category of morbid symptoms. It may be true that men would behave under a Socialist régime in the manner which its champions predict, and in which they must behave in order that it should succeed, but there is nothing whatever, either in our experience of human nature in the past, or in our observation of the human nature we see around us, to warrant us in expecting anything of the kind. Approached from the point of view from which we approach all the ordinary affairs of life, and examined under the same guidance, nearly all Socialist proposals appear to be the product of a disordered imagination. If the Socialists are sane, the rest of mankind is insane, or *vice versa*, and yet an immense body of people, all told, who are leading ordinary lives, are given up to this (apparent) delusion, and hold it with a certain morbid fierceness.

The Crusades, the extermination of the Albigenses, the wars of Edward III. with France, the French Revolution, and the recent sudden outbreak of war worship among ourselves, are all historical illustrations of the theory that large masses of men may be seized with mental disturbance, which, examined as individual aberrations are examined, yields undoubted proofs of what alienists call mania—such as expectation of things which there is no experiential ground for expecting, absence of that regard for consequences which is the leading regulator of individual conduct, great suspicion of the designs of some neighbor, great fear of stupendous and calamitous events, and great dislike of the ordinary pursuits of life, such as steady industry.

In the beginning of the Crusades, a movement in which whole nations took part, and mobs 600,000 strong started for the Holy Sepulchre, the mental condition of the crowd undoubtedly closely resembled that of our Jingoes. They had, in the first place, a "doctrine," and this doctrine forbade them to discuss the probability of success or the possible effect of their enterprise on their own lives or on their own country. In the second place, they suspected and hated every one who tried to dissuade them, as either "heretics" or "infidels," which was the mediæval equivalent for Mugwumps or Anglomaniacs. There is in Joinville an interesting account of the way in which the reign of reason began slowly to return among the Crusaders. The very first sign of it was a consideration of consequences, of what had happened *at home* after the first Crusades, and of what would probably happen after another one. This is, in both national and individual madness, the earliest sign of recovery. Joinville was urged to go on the second crusade. Says he:

"The King of France urged me strongly to go crusading and follow the road of the pilgrimage of the cross. But I answered him, that while I was abroad in the King's service, the King's officers had so levied on and oppressed my people that they were impoverished to such a degree that I did not think either they or I should ever recover from it. I saw clearly that if I went on another pilgrimage of the cross, it would be the total destruction of my poor subjects, and I have since heard many say that those who advised it did great wrong and committed mortal sin. As long as the King remained in France, all the kingdom lived in peace and justice reigned. But as soon as he went abroad, everything began to decline and run down."

Now Joinville, in refusing to go crusading for these reasons—that is, in order to prevent the impoverishment of his people and the desolation of his territory—was doing the exact thing which our Jingoes call "considering the pocket before patriotism." He was bound to crusade by the same order of considerations which bind us to fight for the Monroe Doctrine; and in sacrificing the Holy Sepulchre for a life of quiet peace and industry, he was giving up honor for comfort. But he was nevertheless recovering his sanity in the sense in which the word is used by mental pathologists.

It is impossible not to look on the sudden longing for war as a means of moral culture or amusement which has taken hold of large masses of people among us, as another remarkable outbreak of the same disease. War differs as an agency for the elevation of character from all other agencies for a similar end. Every other means of human culture is as permanent as the race itself—religion, science, art, literature, instruction, discovery, invention, social intercourse, trade, commerce, industry, family affection. Some of these things began their work as soon as man became self-conscious; all of them will continue their work as long as the globe lasts. War alone can do its beneficent work by fits and starts only, and at long intervals, and has to kill large bodies of the people it is trying to improve. There is no fact in human history better known than this. Every Jingo is perfectly aware that, owing to the enormous cost of war in life and treasure, no nation can use it for educational purposes for more than a year or two at a time; but somehow the fact does not make the least impression on him. He tells you that he feels a process of moral deterioration going on within him which nothing but war can arrest, and though he acknowledges that a very short period of war is all he can get, and that tens of thousands of men must die to give him a few months of elevation, he yearns for it just the same. Now, is there not in this a striking resemblance to that form of insanity known as alcoholism? The dipsomaniac knows his pleasure will be short, that the ultimate result will be frightful suffering, that some of the worst consequences will fall on his family; but none of these considerations turn him aside.

Another striking symptom is the disregard of human experience. No Jingo can point to any war which has had the result which he says his war is going to have. He has only to open the history of any of the great military nations to see what the ordinary results of war have been, in the following order: (1) great loss of life among the younger and more vigorous men; (2) tremendous destruction of property; (3) great disorder in the finances and currency; (4) wide diffusion of the spirit of speculation and aleatory gains, and distaste for steady industry among the population; (5) increased contempt for legality and for thinkers, writers, speakers, and for all scientific men, except inventors of explosives; (6) great increase of tramps and of crimes of violence; (7) greatly aggravated hatred for the particular people against whom the war has been waged, and great rejoicing over any calamity that may overtake them; (8) wide diffusion of the belief that a young man who wears a sabre and spurs all day, and passes his time training himself to fight, is a nobler young man than one who labors daily to increase the stock of human comfort, to advance the arts, and support helpless people.

These are among the most notorious facts, as we have said, of human experience. If total indifference to them be not a very important phenomenon for any one who is attempting a diagnosis of mental disease, whether in the public or the individual mind, then all the researches that have ever been made into the pathology of the brain are worthless. We may depend upon it that such manifestations as we are now witnessing in politics mean some lesion of the nervous system in the nature of an epidemic, and Crookes's tubes could not be better employed than in locating it.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

A LETTER written by the late Secretary Gresham on December 31, 1894, implies that he then expected that a permanent treaty of arbitration with Great Britain would be reduced to terms and be ready for ratification within six months of that time. As nothing came of it, we must conclude either that Great Britain declined to enter into it, or that the death of Mr. Gresham was followed by a change of policy, or that the matter became complicated with the Venezuelan boundary dispute and was therefore laid aside. If the Venezuelan question interfered, the untoward result may be chargeable to either side or to both. That must be left to conjecture, yet we can easily see how the most hopeful negotiations may have been brought to a standstill if it were sought to bring in other countries which were not parties to the negotiation.

Whatever may have caused the suspension or failure of the plan which Secretary Gresham had on foot, and notwithstanding the Venezuelan difficulty, we are convinced that there never was a time when both countries were better disposed to such a treaty than now. Certainly there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never was a time when so much popular interest was felt in it on this side of the water as now, and, apart from the Venezuelan dispute, we do not believe that any ministry in England could long sustain itself if it should refuse to enter into such a treaty on fair terms. Arbitration cannot deal with all the questions that may arise between nations. One nation may claim the hitherto undisputed territory of another, or may make a demand inconsistent with the other's sovereignty. For such cases there must be reservations. The Pan-American conference reserved all cases where, in the judgment of the country concerned, its independence was at stake. In order to give the principle of arbitration a fair start it would probably be necessary to name distinctly the class of questions which the two Powers concerned would agree to submit to such a tribunal, leaving them free to deal with other cases as they should see fit at the time when they arise. It would probably be found in practice that no questions could arise which would not be susceptible of such treatment, and which the public opinion of the two countries would not insist upon referring to impartial judges, rather than go to war over them.

The last arbitration we had—the one on the Bering Sea question—was hinted at by Lord Salisbury in his dispatch on the Venezuelan boundary in a tone which implied that he had not much faith in arbitration anyway. He said that, after its decisions were made, the execution of them was not exempt from difficulty; referring, no doubt, to the refusal of our Congress to appropriate the sum of $450,000 to pay the damages agreed upon by Secretary Gresham. This was not a good argument against arbitration, even in that particular case. The Paris tribunal did not fix any sum to be paid as damages. It did provide a means of determining the sum in case the two governments could not agree upon the amount. By the two governments is meant, of course, the branches of government in each whose concurrence is necessary. One of these was our Congress, which refused, as it had a right to do, to adopt the short path to a final settlement which was recommended by our own Department of State. If Congress should further refuse to pay the money for the final award, then the nation would be deeply humiliated, and the cause of arbitration might be properly made a butt of ridicule by anybody.

It may be said that it is not a propitious time for bringing up the question of an arbitration treaty with Great Britain when the relations of the two countries are strained as they are now. On the contrary, we think that this is the best of all times, when the eyes of the people on both sides of the water have had a glimpse of the awful chances of war. The losses caused by the mere penumbra of that calamity have amounted to an incalculable sum—more, probably, than was bid for Government bonds at the sale last week. The anxious days and sleepless nights that men have passed since that dreadful pall fell upon us, have quickened the consciences of men, and have aroused the better classes of society and of the press, the clergy, and all God-fearing men and women, to a more active interest in public affairs than they have taken in many years. They have seen on what a slender thread hang the most momentous issues, and how a few reckless words may set the country on fire without any respectable reason, and perhaps without the intention of the person uttering them. What has happened once may happen again. The circumstances the next time may be less favorable to composition or pacification. Therefore no time should be lost in putting the relations of the two countries on a better basis if one can be found. The common opinion on both sides of the water is that a better basis may be found in a permanent treaty of arbitration.

The opponents of such a treaty tell us that the difficulties in the way of negotiating it are so great that in a majority of cases war would probably be a preferable solution. The answer is that the latter solution is always open. International arbitration cannot prevent a nation from fighting if it really wants to. It only diminishes the chances of war. Its great merit lies in the fact that it gives time for thought and discussion, which in most cases is all that is needed to bring about a pacific solution. It gives "the whip hand" to the sober-minded classes. It puts a new obstacle in the pathway of Jingoes, demagogues, and madmen. In any given case it starts a discussion of the question whether the difficulty in hand is a suitable one for arbitration, and whether it falls within the established rules or not. In most cases it would be found perfectly adapted to such treatment, and in all doubtful cases it would give the advantage to the friends of peace by establishing a national habit of mind in favor of arbitration. While not absolutely interdicting war, it would put greater responsibilities on any country resorting to it, and this would of course diminish the chances of war.

We trust that the movement so auspiciously begun in this country may be earnestly and systematically pushed till we have a society for the promotion of international arbitration in every county in the United States intent upon realizing what Mr. Blaine, in the Pan-American Congress, called "the new Magna Charta, which abolishes war and substitutes arbitration between the American republics"—a condition which is equally fitted for all nations, and is desirable exactly in proportion to their powers of destruction.

THE GERMAN QUARTER-CENTENNIAL.

BERLIN, January 20, 1896.

THE imperial capital has just been celebrating on a grand scale, with parades, illuminations, religious exercises, and speech-making, what the German nation very properly regards as its twenty-fifth birthday. It was on the 18th of January, 1871, that the King of Prussia, through a proclamation read by Bismarck to a company of men assembled in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, formally assumed the imperial title, pledging himself "to protect the rights of the Empire and of its members, to guard the peace and independence of Germany, and to strengthen the strength of the people"; and praying devoutly that he and his successors might be "at all times increasers of the Empire, not by military conquests, but by the goods and gifts of peace, in the domain of national prosperity, freedom, and morality." At that time there was much doubt, both in Germany and outside of it, as to the durability of the structure thus ideally called into being. The memory of the old Empire, the long history of impotent disunion, the fiasco of 1848, the well-known prejudices of the South Germans, all seemed to bode ill for the future of a federal state under Prussian hegemony. But it was even as Friedrich Wilhelm IV. had prophesied and Bismarck had foreseen: blood and iron—Sadowa and Sedan—had done the work. The problem of federal consolidation, which a few years before would have been endlessly difficult, had become so easy that the history of it forms perhaps the least interesting chapter in the annals of the New Empire.

To-day, whatever one may think of the present status of European politics, and of Germany's share in bringing it about and maintaining it, the founding of the Empire stands out clearly as the most momentous political event of the century. Even Waterloo must yield to it in far-reaching importance and in dramatic interest. In creating a powerful and united Germany, with Bismarck for a Chancellor, it shifted the political centre of gravity and led to a new grouping of forces. At the same time it profoundly affected the national character of the Germans themselves. It brought them under the sway of a powerful sentiment to which they had long been unused, save as something to dream of and write verses about. It turned their energies and aspirations in a new direction, opened fresh avenues for their industry and art, and furnished new criteria for judging both present and past. No wonder, then, that the recent jubilee filled them with enthusiasm.

I shall not write of the celebration itself further than to say that it was sufficiently interesting in spite of bad weather and the absence of Bismarck. My purpose is rather to comment briefly upon the span of history which closed on Saturday. The view-point is that of an American scholar who has a warm regard for the German people, but stands aloof from their partisan politics.

The proclamation of 1871 professed to restore a name and dignity that had existed before. In fact, however, there was to be little resemblance between the new fabric and the one which had fallen to pieces in 1806; and, as if to dispel illusions on this subject, the first serious problem of the "German" Empire was to make clear that it would be neither "holy" nor "Roman." The *Kulturkampf* probably settled that question for good, in spite of the subsequent relaxation of the Falk laws. There was no surrender in essentials. The new government had shown its will and its power, but it had also discovered that the clericals were too strong to be kept safely in a state of chronic exacerbation against the Empire. And really it is one thing to "go to Canossa" as the foun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain-head of all authority, and quite another to keep Canossa in sight as a quarter whence votes may be had in a parliamentary exigency. Imperial statesmanship will yet have to learn the same lesson with respect to the Social Democrats.

Aside from the *Kulturkampf*, the history of the New Empire is most instructive along the lines of its military policy, its attempts to deal with socialism, and its measures of internal consolidation. In this last direction a remarkable success has been achieved. To an American or an Englishman, accustomed to see the political situation dominated by the one or the other of two great parties, the constitution of the German Reichstag, representing, as it now does, no less than fourteen different parties, with contingents ranging from one to ninety-five votes, is apt to suggest a dangerous incohesiveness. And yet I venture to express with some confidence the opinion that the federal sentiment is to-day as strong throughout Germany as in the United States. Jealousy of Prussia, the danger most dreaded in the early days, still exists to a degree in the South and Middle German States, but it cuts no figure as an element of disunion; is in fact less ominous than our own well-known sectional antipathies. The military successes of Prussia, the elimination of Austrian intrigue, the mingling of North and South German blood upon the battlefield, the conciliatory attitude of Prussian statesmen in reference to federal representation and reserved rights—all tended from the outset to disarm suspicion and spread the feeling that Prussia deserved her primacy, and would use it not to overreach her sister states but to bind them together for mutual benefit and safety. Even the decisive vote of 1877 in favor of Leipzig as the seat of the Imperial Chamber of Justice was directed not so much against Prussia as against Berlin. Other centrifugal forces of a sectional character are, in a broad view of the matter, hardly worth considering. The "Polish" faction in the Reichstag has averaged pretty steadily about sixteen votes and now stands at nineteen. The "Alsatian" contingent remained constant at fifteen down to 1890, when it dropped to ten. It now stands at eight; that is, the time has already come when the representatives of the annexed provinces are no longer as a matter of course "Alsatians."

The real Alsatian danger proceeds, as is well known, from another quarter, namely, from France. Was it then a mistake to annex Alsace and Lorraine in 1871? It seemed to many at the time, and no doubt many still think, that for once Bismarck was short-sighted in urging this particular demand at the peace of Frankfort. The argument was that the Germanization of the provinces after their two centuries of French allegiance would be a slow and difficult task, which in the end could bring little strength to the Empire and would meanwhile furnish French "patriotism" with a standing pretext for war. It seemed to cast doubt from the start upon the sincerity of Bismarck's vaunted peace policy that he should deliberately put his countrymen in a position which would require them to keep saying constantly (the present Emperor has lately been saying it again): "We want peace, but we will defend to the last man what our swords have won." Was it not an occasion for the waiving of ancient historical claims, or at least for letting the people of the two provinces decide for themselves to whom they would belong, even if it thus became necesary to draw entirely new boundary lines?

To an outsider, especially to an American, this might seem to have been the just and also the politic view of the matter; but there is another view which is taken by the great mass of the German people. They believe that they must be prepared to fight the French *any way*. It was a home-thrust of Bismarck when he drew attention to the fact that within 200 years French armies had invaded Germany thirty-five times. This showed that, *with* Alsace and Lorraine, a pretext for war upon Germany had never been wanting to the French kings; and the cries of "Revenge for Sadowa," in 1866, and "On to Berlin," in 1870, demonstrated the same important fact for the French populace. The Iron Chancellor foresaw that, make what terms he might, Germany would have to face continually the danger of a French war of revenge, if not for Alsace and Lorraine, then for the milliards, for the bombardment of Paris, for anything or for nothing. And this danger would not be lessened, but rather increased, by the establishment of the republic. The nobler spirits of France might be touched by the memory of generous treatment at the hands of a conqueror who had them in his power; but the nobler spirits of a nation seldom determine its war policy, and there was no counting either upon a long memory or upon a high degree of chivalrous susceptibility in the Parisian populace. Add to this that the historical claim of Germany to Alsace and Lorraine is perfectly sound if you only go back far enough, and consider also the immense strategic importance that could be given to Metz and Strassburg in the event of another war, and we have justification enough, from the German point of view, for the drastic policy which was adopted. And the Germans believe that this kind of peace policy has vindicated itself after a trial of twenty-five years; in proof whereof they refer to the Boulanger scare of 1886-7, and the promptness with which it subsided after the overwhelming vote in favor of the septennate by the newly elected Reichstag in the spring of 1887. The only way we can keep France from our throats, they say, is to be ready for her and to let her know that we are ready for her.

Speaking as a humane idealist, to whom war is savagery, militarism calamitous folly, and Jingoism the abomination of desolation, I confess with pain that, in the present stage of civilization, this seems to me also the only safe course for the Germans. One may pine for better days, but one must not blink the facts; and for Germany the most momentous of all facts is the danger to which it is exposed from its neighbors, but especially from France. It has had experience of the weakness of disunion, and out of that experience grew the New Empire. Centuries of invasion and devastation by hostile armies, of impoverishment, insult, humiliation, self-contempt—all this, and not the illusion of military glory, formed the real soil from which grew that intense desire for national unity which carried everything before it twenty-five years ago. No doubt some were captivated by the glamour of the mediæval empire; and no doubt militarism has begotten a class—not all of them Prussian officers, either—to whom the rôle of bully would be acceptable for its own sake. But these persons are in a refreshing minority; what the great majority of Germans want is to be let alone. They have had more of war at home than any other great civilized nation, with the possible exception of Italy, and in consequence are less open to illusions on the subject. There are Jingoes among them, but their warriors of mouth and pen are less numerous and less hysterical than in France, England, or—alas that it should be so!—the United States of America.

During the past few months I have read a pretty large amount of jubilee literature in books and pamphlets and in newspapers of every shade, and I can testify to the moderation that has pervaded it. Very little of bellicose mouthing has come to my attention. Everywhere prominence is given to the fact that peace, the peace of Germany and of Europe, has been from the first the great aim of imperial statesmanship. The Germans believe heartily in the candor of Bismarck's peace policy and in the pacific intentions of the present Emperor. Even during the recent Transvaal excitement they kept their heads remarkably well. There were fire-eaters here and there, but the prevailing tone was one of satirical amusement at the bad logic of the English press. For, they said, the British Government itself repudiates Dr. Jameson as a lawless invader; how, then, can the Emperor's telegram be reasonably construed as an act of hostility to Great Britain? And is there not a measure of sanity in this view of the matter?

But if the Germans want peace, they also believe that an iron necessity requires them to be prepared for war, and that their army is their only sure guarantee of safety. In respect to this subject the Emperor fairly represents an overwhelming majority of the people, although there are, of course, wide differences of opinion as to how much is the least that will suffice. This accounts for the hostile attitude of the Government towards the Social Democracy, and for the wildly absurd proposal of last year to disturb the boasted *Lehrfreiheit* of the German universities. Official circles would not so dread the ventilation of radical ideas concerning the "sacred foundations" of society if they did not fear that the gradual spread of socialistic doctrines would presently undermine the bulwark of national defence. And this fear is well grounded, if we accept as a finality the doctrine that the bigger your army and navy are, the less is the likelihood that you will have to use it. For of late the Socialists have been turning their guns more and more upon militarism, which they characterize as the systematic fleecing of the workingman in the interest of a soldier class. They are about right. Whatever we may think of their Utopian programme in general, we must give them credit for the sagacity of this particular discovery; and so it is hardly too much to say that international socialism is at present about the most promising influence that is making for the disarmament of Europe. If the time shall come—and the thing does not appear unthinkable—when capable representatives of real workingmen, with their minds cleared of cant and chimeras, shall meet in international congresses for the calm discussion of their own interests, the idea can hardly fail to gain ground that those interests are in no way subserved either by war or by the maintenance of enormous armies and navies.

What, then, is the plain lesson of experience for the New Empire with regard to the Social Democrats? It is that they are not to be put down by the sop-to-Cerberus method, and still less by persecution. Their contingent in the Reichstag has steadily risen from nine in 1874 to forty-five in 1893, and it is not unlikely that the Emperor's recent passionate deliverance against them may net them a few more seats at the next election. They thrive best under the operation of laws specially aimed at their particular propaganda. This, if nothing else, should suggest that it will not do, in a country where men are to vote at all, to treat a large

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body of voters as enemies of the country and "without a fatherland," because of opinions which they honestly hold respecting the sanctity of existing social and economic arrangements. Their propaganda must be met with argument, and not with force, or blind denunciation, or annoying police intervention. The foolish muzzling of the press and abolition of unions must cease. The Socialists must be recognized as a legitimate party, having the same right to its opinions that other parties have. In other words, the party must be made respectable by being treated as if it were respectable. With increased prestige will come a heightened sense of responsibility, a better leadership, and a keener sense for the practicable in legislation. It is a matter of general experience that nothing tames a radical like responsibility.

But, above all, as the best means of meeting the Socialists, and for other and broader reasons, imperial statesmanship should begin to use its influence for the mitigation of the disgraceful condition of affairs in which Europe is now living. Granted that Germany cannot disarm alone, and cannot disarm first; still, it can show a little more unequivocally that it desires peace, and only peace, and it can exert itself by diplomatic means for a general reduction of the peace footing of European armies. It can make a little less conspicuous its reliance upon force and the show of force. It can take a firm stand for international arbitration. It can work for the extension of the Triple Alliance to a general European alliance for the preservation of peace on the basis of the *status quo*. It has shown that it is not afraid, and that it can take care of itself, and has made a winged word out of Bismarck's famous saying in his great speech of 1888: "We Germans fear God and nothing else in the world." This was not a bad motto for the Empire in the first quarter-century of its existence: but a better one for the second would be: "We Germans fear God alone, and the God that we fear is the God of humanity."

CALVIN THOMAS.

THE EASTERN QUESTION IN CRETE.

BOSTON, January 20, 1896.

AT the partition of the Eastern Empire, Crete fell to Boniface of Montferrat, who sold it to Venice; and from Venice, after twenty-four years of bitter resistance, in 1669, the Turks wrested it. Under the Turk its fortunes have been varied, but they have always been stormy and the state of things unsettled. The Venetians left some accounts of their rapacity in Crete, and an English adventurer of the seventeenth century had a stirring experience there. In the eighteenth we hear little about the island. There was a great insurrection in 1821, lasting some years; in 1830, France, England, and Russia intervened to place Crete under the rule of Mehemet Ali, viceroy of Egypt. In 1840, back it went to the Sultan. Heralded in 1859 by a slight revolt, in 1866 began the great revolution which lasted three years and exhausted both parties. For this struggle, the book of Mr. Stillman, then American consul, is the authority. In it and in a little Greek volume, 'Outrages in Crete in the Year 1867,' by an English volunteer, Mr. Hilary Skinner, you may read stories like those of Armenia—the usual incidents of Turkish warfare; insult, rape, and massacre. In 1870 a new era began. Pressure from the Powers, and the narrow escape from losing Crete entirely, compelled the Porte to reforms which have resulted in a kind of constitution, the appointment of Greek governors over Greek districts, etc. Notwithstanding, there have been occasional risings—in 1889, in particular, a rather threatening *émeute;* and these, I believe, are likely to continue.

So much of history seems necessary for an understanding of the present condition of things, and, brief as this sketch is, it contains nearly all the characteristic history of the isle—a record of changing masters and of steady opposition by the subjects. The various foreign masters have conquered, but the islanders have never submitted. The physical character of the place has much to do with this. Three great mountain ranges form the backbone of the island, and in a length of 160 miles there is only one plain of any extent. Mountains and their ready refuge; the proved courage, world-wide, of mountaineers; the very isolation—assist the struggle. Crete is hard to conquer, hard to keep.

The traveller from Europe meets at Candia the old order. A steamer bears him there, but, on landing, he enters a life framed in an Old-World walled city, innocent of this era and of modern improvements. The population is two-thirds Mohammedan, but the Greek third is a select body, the best of the isle. In a sense, the Greeks are the masters of affairs, the merchants, landholders, physicians of the town. Politically it is another thing. The Greeks are energetic and prosperous; the Turk is willing enough to have his work done for him. Many of the Greeks are graduates of the fine university at Athens; some, of the European universities; and all, eager for progress with the intellectual keenness of their race. Numerically a small body, they are the real *citizens* of the town, their influence preponderating in nearly every way. All that may be called "society" is Greek. To this element, continually restless and progressive, is opposed the sluggish, unyielding mass of Turkish population, with its leaders of the official class, Mussulmans from various parts of the empire who are billeted in Crete. The Greeks are, in all respects, European, western, in education, life (so far as is possible), religion, aims. Their intellectual outlook is westward; Islam faces for ever to the East. Such facts as follow may show how it happens that a Christian population can never dwell in peace with a Mohammedan, most of all if the latter, whose creed knows no tolerance, is in the saddle. A Turk may come to your house, may see your wife and family. His wife you may not even allude to; and while she is within, you cannot step across his threshold. Your Sunday is on the first day of the week; his is on the sixth. All the progress and history of Europe is your heritage; he remembers the day when his armies beat at the gates of Vienna—the day when the Sultan lost the fair province of Greece. The whole harem system, with its seclusion of women, makes any fusion of sects or mutual sympathy impossible. By the Turks themselves it is even felt to be a burden; in Crete the rule is, one wife. To maintain the lawful four wives and attendants almost implies a city house and a large income. In the country, where the Turkish peasants have to work, both sexes in the fields together, any real seclusion of women is impracticable. They have had to compromise. Before men of the same village women do not veil themselves, but only on the approach of a stranger.

The life of the Greek women is still more constrained. Those of the upper class rarely step upon the street. On winter evenings they are taken to the performances at the Greek theatre; in summer, to a small esplanade to hear the garrison band play. In the early morning, while the streets are empty, they attend church. Veiled Turkish women throng the bazaars, but I remember the sensation caused by the appearance, one day, of a lady in European dress in the square. It was the wife of the Austrian consul. Two facts of daily life connote much in this connection. The ladies never go to walk because of the risk of insulting remarks by passing soldiers; at the theatre they never enter the body of the house, to which Turks of the upper class resort, but sit alone in a gallery. The monotony of their life is appalling. Their recreations are domestic only, and the years pass away in trifling pleasures, in the absence of all that is considered indispensable by the modern woman in free lands.

In the country the proportion of the races changes, and the Greek is vastly in the majority. In Crete the real Oriental Turk sticks to the cities; the country Turk is nearly always the descendant of Greek renegades, Oriental only in his creed. Ethnically the eparchies or districts are checkered by villages of the two religions. Some are wholly appropriated by one party; others contain distinct settlements of both. Rarely a Turk lives in a Greek village; but the converse, I believe, never happens.

The life of the Cretan peasant is civilization at its lowest degree. To strike the average, I take a typical family. The village, say, is situated inland twenty miles from the city. There are no roads. All communication must be by horse or donkey over a rough trail. If it is near the shire town of the eparchy, our village will receive a weekly mail brought from the city by a mounted soldier. But this service is liable to frequent interruption, and, in time of trouble, is remitted entirely. The village itself is built of stone, uncemented and unplastered, the interiors with dirt floors and unglazed windows: in short, it consists of rude, smoky, dim hovels alive with vermin. In most houses there is no bed. A low platform of masonry and coverings of dirty rugs serve. The occupants sleep in their clothes, and personal cleanliness is disregarded. Our typical family rise at four daily, and go out to the fields at some distance from the village to care for the vineyard, the olive grove, or the barley-field. By these they live. Their food is black bread, olives, vegetables, wine, coffee. At night the lamp is a wick flickering and smoking in a cup of oil. Pleasures there are none. Perhaps the place has its school. Out of their scanty store the folk support what they call a "Hellenic school"; *i. e.*, one where elements of ancient and pure modern Greek are taught. The Government discourages but does not positively forbid such schools, but the text-books have to be smuggled in from Athens.

The effect of religion on a people is apt to tally with the character of the clergy. Apart from the cities, the Greek Church in Crete does not appear to advantage. The bishops and higher clergy are men of sanctity and learning. With the exception of an hereditary hatred of Rome, their views are broad and liberal. Throughout the country the priests are of the peasant class, illiterate, dirty, and unrespected. Some are even criminals who have taken sanctuary in the profession. Others deal openly in magic. Churches are very common in the country-side. Every mountain-top and desert-place has its shrine, built ages ago, and often opened only on the saint's anniversary. The village churches are built afield, usually at some distance. Services are held before sunrise. The men seldom go; the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

women, as the world over, are regular attendants. There are no seats and no preaching. The service is a mumbled ritual, lasting but a few minutes. Religious teaching and its effect on character, the doctrine of good works, the ethical value of the Christian faith, are unreflected in the lives of the peasantry. The Greek mind has been and is practical and unemotional with respect to religion. This appears in the Greek rite, which, although highly ritualistic in many ways, is yet, as compared with the Roman, austere and Puritan. The Greek attitude is distinctly intellectual, unmoral. The real value of the Church to the people has been ethnical—to unite the race in a solid front against the Turk. In actual fighting, the priests have often held command; and the cross, in default of a country and a flag, has been the symbol to rally under.

The resultant character of the peasantry is better than the environment. The Cretan virtues are courage, intelligence, hospitality; the defects—superstition, hard-heartedness, and an ineradicable lust for blood. In a life of misery and uncertainty men grow callous, lack sympathy for others, and do not expect it for themselves. For centuries the people of Crete have lived under oppressive and despotic aliens. Masters not of their choosing have been forced upon them, and, although the Venetians were hard drivers, the latest comer has been the worst. At no period has the tenure of life been secure. Every passer upon the road might prove an enemy. The mountains and Turkish justice are lenient to the murderer. Like all southern races, the Cretans are quick to anger; the knife flashes close upon the word. Their antecedents have made them fighters. Male children are ardently desired by parents, not so much as bread-winners as defenders of the cause. The skirmish is the only excitement. The extraordinary value attached to the name palikári, "fighting-man," and the habit of bearing arms, are significant. We have the middle ages here. Accustomed to frequent uprisings and the sacking of his home, the peasant does not care for improvement. Men and women move in a sad world—where there is no hope and no great desire for life; their courage is partly that of indifference and despair. In the case of the Sphakiote, the western mountaineer, into whose precipitous province no Turkish army has ever forged, it becomes aggressive and picturesque. "Sphakiote," as an epithet in Crete, is almost as great a compliment as 'spalikári."

The trade of the island to-day is trifling, and consists chiefly in the exportation of crude olive-oil to Italy and England. The imports are from Trieste, a traffic built up and maintained by the Austrian Lloyd Company. Under good management Crete could become the most prosperous of the Greek islands, being especially adapted to vine-culture, and, indeed, famous so recently as Shakspere's time for the Malmsey wine. As yet the phylloxera has given little trouble. Improvements that are of prime necessity are a system of roads, the dredging of the harbors, regular mail-service, and a railway inland. At present, steamers cannot enter the haven at Candia, and whenever the wind blows hard from the north, as it does pretty regularly in winter, they cannot even anchor off the port. At Canéa, the small political capital at the western end of Crete, the Bay of Suda creates a natural harbor. Consequently the Canéa mail is landed with regularity, but letters for Candia, for lack of roads, cannot be brought overland. Thus the largest city of Crete and centre of commerce, although but thirty-six hours from the Piræus, is often without a mail for seventeen or eighteen days. Post-offices are maintained both by the Government and by the Austrian Company; at each office only one clerk distributes the mail of 24,000 people. The Eastern Cable Company has a station at Candia, but no messages may be in cipher or in terms unintelligible to the Turkish censor. Canéa and Candia each issue fortnightly a tiny Greek newspaper, rigidly muzzled by the authorities, a mere straining of expurgated news. Newspapers from abroad and books, even school-books, are nominally contraband: but they usually make their way through the mails.

None of these things can be bettered until security of life and property is established. Revolutions and disturbances occurring every few years preclude any material advancement. The rising of 1889, as described to me by many participants, is a type of these affairs. Precipitated largely by the jealousies of local politics, the Turks, however, soon turned it into a race quarrel. Men were found murdered in the fields about the city, and reprisals by both parties immediately began. On the outgoing steamers the Greeks of the upper class hurried their wives and daughters off to Athens for safety. All shops conducted by them, with the exception of one, were closed, and street fighting was of daily occurrence. Under the flags of the consuls hundreds of women and children took shelter. The principal nations of Europe, much to the Turks' disgust, are represented in Candia, nearly all the consuls being Greek. For the moment these are the only persons secure in the city. As a result, consulships are eagerly sought, but they are obtained only after great difficulties. The present representative of Spain waited eight years for recognition, and the accomplished gentleman appointed two years ago as the representative of the United States, at this writing has not received his exequatur. In spite of consuls, in 1889 no European was safe on the street. An Italian from a ship in port, strolling up town, was shot at sight by a passing Turk. An indemnity was paid to Italy, the murderer sent to the Turkish prison in Rhodes, and pardoned out at the next celebration of the Sultan's birthday. *Ex uno disce omnes!*

In this difficulty the Government troops, for the first time, took no open part. A mob of lower-class Turks, armed surreptitiously with military rifles, controlled the city and even sallied out to attack the fine Greek village of Arkhánis, nine miles away. After some sharp fighting they were repulsed. Meanwhile, the influential Greeks were haggling at Constantinople, a new Pasha was set over the island, and a kind of truce was arranged. It is all quite conventional in Crete. A few villages sacked, much rape and bloodshed, appeals to the Porte, indemnities and reforms promised, and life goes on as before.

In February, 1894, the Government, for the first time since 1866, decided to execute some of the murderers with whom the jails were crowded. And so, one night, five criminals—picked apparently at random, except that four were Christian and one Ottoman—were taken out and hung in the midnight hours. At Candia, only one of the five suffered—the gallows being a tree in the central square, where all must pass on their business; and here, in the morning, the astounded and enraged Greeks found their countryman swinging, without any mitigating circumstance of black cap, his sentence in Greek and Turkish pinned upon his breast. When this came to the ears of the country, there was great excitement. Within a week the bodies of three Turks were found murdered by the wayside, and once more the account was squared.

Turkey will never willingly let Crete go. Pride and policy, the clinging of the "Sick Man" to his diminishing dominions, forbid that. Since 1889 he has also strengthened his hold by erecting barracks in each province and a military telegraph, the use of which is practically prohibited in Greek districts, since all messages must be in Turkish. The island is heavily garrisoned by about eighteen thousand troops, including regulars and the local forces of gendarmes. A party in Crete, moved by the fine things done by England for Cyprus, are all for English occupation; another goes so far as to prefer the Turk to the Englishman. "Once here," they reason, "England will improve, develop, fortify; but she will never loose her grasp." And yet they might remember the Ionian Isles. The great majority are for Greece, as Greece is for Crete, although aware of the present impossibility of their desire. "Greece wants Crete but cannot get her," a Cretan said to me on the steamer, and it is the keynote of the situation. "Manifest destiny," to use a phrase of the politicians, points to the union of two peoples alike in race, religion, and speech, still more closely bound by a common experience of Turkish oppression; and to the revived glories of the Byzantine Empire, the "great idea" in which all good Greeks live, Crete as well as Constantinople will be indispensable. As the case stands, a European war and the dismemberment of Turkey, so likely to follow, is the hope of the island. While Europe hesitates and wavers at the frontiers, Crete awaits her hour.

JOHN ALDEN.

Correspondence.

THE RECOGNITION OF CUBA: GRANT'S PRECEDENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: No doubt a great pressure is being brought to bear upon President Cleveland to make him take strong action regarding the Cuban revolution. The great sympathy of our people with the Cubans who desire independence forms the groundwork for this pressure. But as to what the President should do there is considerable difference of opinion. Some friends of the Cubans propose the recognition of belligerency only, others insist on recognizing at once the independence of the revolutionary Government, the seat of which appears to be at present in the city of New York. Some go so far as to advocate immediate annexation, whether the Cubans wish it or not.

The action of President Grant in 1875 in regard to Cuban troubles is frequently referred to as a correct precedent, which President Cleveland should take for an example. Surely those who thus point to it must be little acquainted with its history. It may not be without interest to make a brief review of the proceedings at the time regarding events in the island of Cuba; and in the first place it may be as well to compare the situation then and the condition of things now. The Cuban revolt at the time Grant brought the matter before Congress (December, 1874) had lasted nearly seven years, during which time Spain had acted very provokingly, had confiscated property of inoffensive American citizens, had arrested American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizens suspected as filibusters, had tried them by court-martial and had shot them. Both parties, Spaniards and Cubans, had carried on the war most cruelly, and had laid waste great parts of the beautiful island. The struggle is now carried on in about the same way. Martinez de Campos was then, and was until a short time ago, the commander of the Spanish forces. But the present outbreak is not quite one year old, and the chances of success are quite uncertain as yet, the bulletins of both parties deserving but slight credence.

Now as to the facts of the case as they transpired in 1875 and 1876. In his message President Grant briefly stated his views of the question of Cuba, transmitting at the same time a dispatch to the Spanish Government written by Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State, a copy of which (as stated in the dispatch) was also sent to the principal European Powers, inviting them to coöperate with the United States in putting an end to the cruel war then raging in the island of Cuba. The message and dispatch were rather coolly received, particularly on account of the invitation to foreign Powers to join the United States in an intervention in the war between Spain and the Cubans. This request was considered as against our well-established principle to keep aloof from foreign alliances. Secretary Fish appeared before the committee on foreign relations of the House of Representatives to explain his dispatch. The newspapers at the time published substantially the dispatch itself. It alleged that the insurrection in Cuba had lasted some seven years; that Spain had been entirely unable to suppress it; that the President was convinced that the final issue would be to break up the bonds which attached the Cuban colony to Spain (this view of the case was in various ways repeated over and over again in the dispatch); that the American people naturally deeply sympathized with the Cuban people, who desired independence; that no effective steps had been taken to reform abuses; that material interests of trade and commerce of the United States in the meantime had been impaired to a degree which called for remonstrance, if not for another line of conduct, on the part of all commercial nations; that the United States were the principal customers for Cuban products, and therefore more interested in arresting the wanton destruction of property; that it had become a serious question how long this condition of things should be allowed to exist, and whether the point had not been reached when longer endurance would be impossible; that in the opinion of the President the time had arrived when the interests of this country demanded the speedy and satisfactory end of the strife which was devastating Cuba; that a disastrous conflict of more than seven years' duration had demonstrated the inability of Spain to maintain peace on an island lying at our door. The dispatch then referred particularly to the celebrated case of the *Virginius*, which, while professedly sailing under American colors, was seized by the Spaniards; American citizens being taken out and shot by judgment of a court martial. The President hopes (continued the dispatch) that Spain will spontaneously adopt measures looking to a reconciliation and speedy restoration of peace; but, in the absence of any prospect of a termination of the war or any change in the manner in which it has been conducted on either side, he feels that the time is at hand when it may be the duty of other governments to intervene. He had accordingly submitted the subject in this light to the consideration of Congress.

Secretary Fish further stated to the committee that the foreign Powers had been invited to exercise only their moral influence to settle the troubles in Cuba as soon as possible. At the same time the Secretary said the foreign Powers had been assured that nothing was further from the President than the idea of an annexation of Cuba, as the President believed that such annexation would have a very injurious effect on his own country; that the foreign Powers had received the request of the United States kindly, and had promised their moral support, except Austria, which had declined any sort of interference.

Spain did not long delay an answer to Mr. Fish's dispatch to Gen. Cushing, our Minister at Madrid. This answer appears only in the journals of that day. It would seem that neither the dispatch nor the reply was ever published in the diplomatic correspondence of our State Department. Mr. Fish is reported to have stated to the committee that Spain had replied in a manner "quite inoffensive." The language may have been very polite, but, if the papers give the reply correctly, it was really a sharp one. It set out with the allegation that the statement in Mr. Fish's dispatch, that material interests as to trade and commerce had been so impaired as to call for remonstrance if not for another line of conduct, was not founded on fact; that, on the contrary, the trade with Cuba, as concerned both imports and exports, had, since the insurrection, not decreased, but greatly increased, thus striking at the very basis of the principal complaint of the United States. (This fact, as stated by Spain, was admitted by some of our leading commercial papers.) The reply is said to have further alleged that Spain had tried to satisfy all just demands that had been made by people who had suffered from the disturbances in Cuba; that the *Virginius* incident had been already amicably settled; that no important question was pending between the two countries, and that therefore the action of the President was wholly inexplicable; that the insurrection was confined to the mountainous regions of the island, which were almost inaccessible, sterile, and without any commerce; that but for the sympathy shown by the American people and the active help which the insurgents had received from North American filibusters, peace would long ago have been restored; that Spain would, however, make every effort to pacify the country.

Here the matter appears to have been quietly dropped. Martinez de Campos not long afterwards succeeded in settling the seven years' struggle. It would seem, then, that President Grant's intervention was not a success, and certainly in many respects cannot be commended as a precedent to President Cleveland. It is well known that the latter some time ago expressed his opinion that the recognition of the insurgents as a belligerent Power would be of no benefit to the Cubans or to our country. We have every confidence that the President will carefully consider the question of recognition, for, should he decide in favor of independence, it would, if Spain felt herself strong enough, be certainly followed by a declaration of war. G. K.

BALTIMORE UP TO DATE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Something may be allowed for the time which evidently elapsed between the writing of Mr. Stephen Bonsal's article on "New Baltimore" and its appearance in the February issue of *Harper's Magazine*. This will account for the reference to the old court-house as still standing, and to the long term of office of our late Mayor as still continuing. It will not account, however, for the negro hackmen and policemen whom the writer has been able to discover at the Camden station of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, nor for some of his statements regarding several of our institutions. I read twice the account of the library with which I am connected, to be sure that the writer was not intending to be humorous. The beautiful picture of the 400,000 books to which "the readers of Baltimore have had access" for "seven years," and of the "supply wagons" of the library "dashing through the streets of Baltimore, like express wagons during the Christmas season," is very effective, but it is not quite accurate. We have not, and never have had, any "supply wagons"; consequently, there is no danger that any citizen will be run over by these wagons "dashing through the streets." We have bought books more rapidly than any other public circulating library in the world, to the best of my knowledge; but although we have collected them and circulated them for *ten* instead of "seven" years, we possess only about 165,000 volumes instead of 400,000. Mr. Pratt's gift to the city was made *fourteen* and not "some ten years ago."—Yours respectfully,

Bernard C. Steiner.

The Enoch Pratt Free Library
of Baltimore City, January 23, 1896.

THE NEED OF A NEW REVIEW.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Permit me to call attention to the fact that the new *American Historical Review* has already been obliged to print a second edition of its initial number. Before it was issued, one of its most sanguine promoters said it was hoped that in two years a subscription-list of one thousand might possibly be secured. Evidently, the willingness of the American people to support what is clearly shown to be the best of its kind was as much underestimated as was its willingness to subscribe for Government bonds last year.

If such men as Profs. Lounsbury, Shorey, Kittredge, Woodberry, Gayley, Marsh, Winchester, and others would but formulate a plan for an "Inter-University Review of Literature," the money to guarantee it for a few years would easily be found, and within that time its proper *clientèle* would gather to its support as soon as it showed its claim upon them. Wm. C. Lawton.

Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, February 9, 1896.

Notes.

It is announced that the Dunlap Society of this city has been reorganized under the presidency of Douglas Taylor. The treasurer is Daniel Frohman, and the secretary Evert Jansen Wendell, No. 8 East Thirty-eighth Street. Its first publication will be issued from the De Vinne Press in the spring, and will probably be a paper upon Early American Theatres by the Hon. Charles P. Daly.

S. S. McClure is about to publish a Life of Lincoln based upon the material already accumulated in *McClure's Magazine*, but much extended. The number of portraits will be very large.

The Life of Phillips Brooks undertaken, but left unfinished, by his brother, the late Rev.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arthur Brooks, will be completed by Prof. A. V. G. Allen, of Cambridge, Mass, and published by E. P. Dutton & Co.

We are to have from Charles Scribner's Sons a new Life of Madame Roland, by Miss Ida M. Tarbell; 'The Jewish Scriptures,' in the light of the latest criticism, by Amos K. Fiske; 'Sunrise Stories,' essays on the literature of Japan, by Tozo Takayanagi and Roger Riordan; and 'The Book of a Hundred Games,' by Miss Mary White.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. promise 'The Life and Letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes,' by John T. Morse, jr; 'William H. Seward,' by Thornton K. Lathrop; 'The Life of Thomas Hutchinson,' by James K. Hosmer; 'The Life, Public Services, Addresses, and Letters of Elias Boudinot,' by J. J. Boudinot; the fourth volume of the 'History of Prussia,' left unfinished by the late Prof Herbert Tuttle of Cornell, and treating of the early part of the Seven Years' War, with a biographical introduction by Prof. Herbert B. Adams; 'Quaint Nantucket,' by William Root Bliss; 'In New England Fields and Woods,' by Rowland E. Robinson; 'Spring Notes from Tennessee,' by Bradford Torrey; 'Four-handed Folk,' by Mrs. Olive Thorne Miller; 'Kokoro: Hints and Echoes of Japanese Inner Life,' by Lafcadio Hearn; 'The Browning Phrase-Book,' by Marie Ada Molineux, M.A., Ph.D., uniform with the Riverside Browning; 'Moral Evolution,' by Prof. George Harris of Andover; 'The Expansion of Religion,' by E. Winchester Donald, D.D.; 'Pirate Gold,' by F. J. Stimson; 'Tom Grogan,' by F. Hopkinson Smith; and the Complete Works of Burns, edited by W. E. Henley and T. F. Henderson, a centenary edition in four volumes, limited to 150 copies.

One cannot too much congratulate the schools on the ever-extending "Riverside Literature Series" of Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; the quadruple numbers forming Quaker-like linen-bound duodecimo volumes in the best of print, and extremely moderate in price. Five of the latest of these are 'Robinson Crusoe,' 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' 'Ivanhoe,' 'Tom Brown's School Days,' and Dana's 'Two Years Before the Mast.' But the public at large is equally interested in knowing of these editions, which meet all conditions except the luxurious.

Another series deserving attention in and out of school is the "Arden Shakspere," of which the American publishers are D. C. Heath & Co., Boston. Half-a dozen volumes are before us. They are convenient to the hand or pocket, clearly if compactly printed, and very fully annotated—not for the youngest minds.

Macmillans continue their little reprint of Charles Kingsley's novels with 'Yeast,' and of Dickens's novels, edited by his son, with 'A Tale of Two Cities and the Mystery of Edwin Drood,' after the editions of 1869 and 1870 respectively. The younger Dickens vouches, in his introduction, for the story that Carlyle, in response to a request from the author of 'A Tale of Two Cities' for the loan of a few authorities on the French Revolution, sent him two cartloads. Dickens repaid this courtesy in his preface by averring that "no one can hope to add anything to the philosophy of Mr. Carlyle's wonderful book." He cherished the vain idea of having the story dramatized for representation in France in the first decade of the Second Empire. As to 'Edwin Drood,' the editor sets at rest any speculation that the hero of the story was not actually murdered. His comments on Mr. Forster as a literary executor (in connection with both stories) are consonant with earlier ones in this same notable series.

From the same firm we have Peacock's 'Headlong Hall, and Nightmare Abbey,' in the one-volume reprint of standard novels of the early part of the century. Mr. Saintsbury furnishes an introduction.

The welcome to be accorded to a new edition of Sir George Dasent's 'Tales from the Fjeld' (Putnams) is not, in our opinion, because of Mr. Moyr Smith's "more than a hundred illustrations." These we cannot praise in gross or in detail. It is the "mother English" into which the translator "tried to turn his Norse original" which has made and will preserve this collection a classic, remarkable among all translations for its idiomatic purity.

By omitting episodes and detailed descriptions, and replacing them occasionally by brief summaries in smaller type, Mr. A. de Rougemont of Chautauqua University has compressed Victor Hugo's 'Les Misérables' into one volume, leaving the *story* intact (New York: W. R. Jenkins). Five hundred pages of large print are sufficient for this achievement, and there are twenty pages of notes.

Books about book-plates approach very near the category of *biblia abiblia*, consisting as they do, in the main, of formal and informal lists diversified only by exemplary illustrations. The latest is 'Ladies' Book-plates, for Collectors and Book-lovers,' by Norna Labouchere (London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan). General considerations and detailed descriptions, quite unreadable except by way of reference, occupy two-thirds of this pretty volume. Formal alphabetical lists follow English, foreign, and "joint" plates—these last of husband and wife. The reproduced designs are abundant and suggestive; many of them beautiful. Not a few are *by* women as well as for them.

Three periodicals, each excellent and unique, reappear on our table in a bound volume for the past year—namely, the eighth of *Garden and Forest* (New York), the seventh of the *Green Bag* (Boston Book Co.), and the eleventh of *Babyhood* (New York). They are all capable of profiting those who do not, as well as those who do, profess a special interest in things suburban and horticultural, legal and infantile.

Two more volumes, xliv. and xlv., of the 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) extend the work from Paston to Pockrich, and are peculiarly rich in great names, as Peel, the Pitts, William Penn, St. Patrick, the Plantagenets; besides William Paterson, founder of the Bank of England, Sir W. Petty, Isaac Penington, Mrs. Piozzi, Gen. Picton, Mark Pattison, Walter Pater, and Samuel Pepys, who (like Mrs. Piozzi) falls to Leslie Stephen, and is treated with delicacy and characteristic pungency. Another excellent example of restraint is shown in the sketch of that shady character, Cora Pearl; and another adventuress, Teresia Constantia Phillips, is commemorated not without reason, as her memoirs "exerted a considerable influence upon Bentham's youthful imagination, especially their account of the chicanery incidental to law proceedings." The American section is unusually strong, embracing—in addition to Penn and Chatham and Shelburne—Sir William Pepperell, Sir William Phipps, Hugh Peters, George Phillips (ancestor of Wendell Phillips), Abraham Pierson, founder of Newark, N. J., George Percy, one of the founders of Virginia with Capt. John Smith, and the Pennsylvania pilgrim Pastorius, whose inclusion in the Dictionary seems somewhat difficult to account for. The Irish forger Pigott is among the baser characters admitted to this equal sky.

It has been to the advantage of the public, as it must be to the satisfaction of the author, that a new edition of Col. George E. Waring's "How to Drain a House,' originally published in 1885 (D. Van Nostrand Co.), is brought up to the standard of to-day by a few annotations, not by rewriting, the last chapter excepted. This little book, whose sub-title is "Practical Information for Householders," is in the author's clear and practical style. He wastes no time in the discussion of varieties of method, but dogmatically expresses his opinion as to the best. That is what the ordinary house-owner wants, and as this opinion is the outcome of intelligence and experience, he is perfectly safe in adding it to his library of practical economics as an untechnical, straightforward, useful book.

'Outlines of Legal History' (Macmillan) is the title of a manual prepared by Mr. Archer M. White, an English barrister who has not only fitted large numbers of pupils for legal examinations, but has also passed many himself with distinguished success. The amount of information which Mr. White has contrived to pack into a duodecimo of less than 250 pages is certainly extraordinary. The book is of course unreadable except by those over whom examination impends, but it answers the purpose of an encyclopædia of courts and procedure, while containing much detail concerning the development of law. The method adopted is to describe first the legal system now existing, then the conditions out of which it developed, and then to trace the history of some of the more important doctrines of the law. The severe compression necessary is not always favorable to the clearest exposition, but we have noted little obscurity except that due to condensation. For its chief end the work must be regarded as remarkably well adapted, as it will be found valuable by others as well as students cramming for examination.

'The Child and Childhood in Folk-Thought' (Macmillan) is a voluminous collection of everything that has been said about children by the anthropologists, in the first instance, and by writers of every sort after that. Children appear under the head of magi and medicine-men, priests and oracle-keepers, physicians and healers, teachers and judges, saints and heroes, poets and musicians. The influence of the child-idea and its accompaniments upon sociology, mythology, religion, and language is matter for discussion. The subject is of peculiar interest now that the scientists have informed us that the child alone possesses in their fulness the distinctive features of humanity, that the highest human types as represented in men of genius present a striking approximation to the child type, and that adolescence is to some extent progress in degeneration and senility. There is an index to this volume which should be the emulation of all future makers of books.

Brentano sends us a French whimsey, a child's library of inch high volumes in a glass cabinet "style Louis XV."—fables from Perrault, La Fontaine, Fénelon, and Florian, tales from Canon Schmid and Moreau, 'Aladdin,' 'The Forty Thieves,' 'The Wandering Jew' in verse, etc. Happily the type of these Liliputian volumes is not proportionate to their size, but is readable without straining of the eyes.

In the *Temps* of January 9 there is an account of an interview with M. Ary Renan, which throws some pleasant light on the life of his illustrious father among his books. Renan was a book-lover, but not in the least a bibliophile. He cared nothing for rare editions. He loved books, not for any beau-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ty of print or binding, but for their contents alone. They were his tools, which he used every day. It was with great reluctance that he ever sent any of them to the binder. He could not get on without them even for a day, and it is remembered that once, when he was absolutely obliged to send a volume to be bound, he bought another copy of it to use during the few days of its absence. All his life, books surrounded him, overwhelmed him, shut him in. They gradually overflowed from one room to another until the whole story on which he lived was full. M. Ary Renan says that he still remembers with horror the several occasions when the family removed from one house to another, and especially one dreadful time when the *déménageurs* heaped the books together in a vast number of baskets, having classified them cleverly, as it seemed, in accordance with their size.

The priority in the method of photographing through solid bodies recently discovered by Prof. Röntgen is now claimed by the Hungarian physicist Lenard, who in 1894 succeeded in photographing through pasteboard by means of the rays emanating from the cathode or negative pole of a galvanic battery. He published an account of his experiments at that time in the *Annalen für Physik und Chimie* (vol. li., p. 225) with plates showing the results, but does not seem to have pursued the subject further or to have made any practical application of his discovery. Prof. Röntgen explains the purely accidental manner in which his discovery was made, and denies that he is under any indebtedness whatever to the researches of Prof. Lenard.

Dr. Parker of Harvard gave the result of some interesting experiments on the sea anemone at the recent meeting of the Morphological Society, as reported in *Science*. The œsophagus of this little animal is lined with cilia whose constant wavy motion causes the food to pass onward from the mouth into the stomach. But their action can be reversed when occasion arises, and by this means innutritious substances can be thrown out from the stomach. If an anemone is fed with fragments of meat and pieces of paper soaked in meat juice, both are taken into the stomach, but the paper fragments are afterwards thrown out by means of the backward action of the cilia. More than this, the organ of sense in the tentacles is capable of a certain degree of education. After a number of trials (seventeen or more) the animal learns to discriminate, the paper being rejected and the meat swallowed. The memory is, however, short-lived, for on the following day the lesson must be learned anew.

—The question of the admission of women to the University for the study of medicine has lately excited considerable discussion in Vienna. The well-known professor of surgery, Dr. E. Albert, being no longer able to ignore this movement, published a pamphlet against it, entitled 'Die Frauen und das Studium der Medicin' (Vienna: Hölder), and written with the same spirit that animated John Knox more than three centuries ago when he blew 'The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women.' He begins with the assertion that all works of the human hand which we see around us and which minister to our comfort, were made by man. When we rise in the morning, he adds in illustration of this proposition, all the dishes in which our breakfast is served we owe to masculine ingenuity and invention; hence the female is intellectually disqualified for the study of medicine. Not only is the logic of this syllogism exceedingly faulty, but also the premises are false or at least highly problematical. All prehistoric researches tend to prove that woman contributed more than man to the growth of primitive civilization. It was her feeble attempts to cultivate the soil and to raise grain that gradually effected the transition from nomadic to sedentary life; it was because she learned to spin and weave that cloth was substituted for skins as raiment, and there is hardly any doubt that the first rude pottery was formed by her hands. A clear and cogent reply to Albert's inconsequent lucubration is Prof. Dr. Emanuel Hannak's 'Die Frauen und das Studium der Medicin kritisch beleuchtet' (Vienna: Hölder), in which the author shows the injustice of excluding women from the most efficient means of culture and then censuring them for being uncultivated. He reviews Dr. Albert's pamphlet in detail, and proves that the objections urged by him simply beg the whole question at issue, and declares in conclusion that it is the duty of the state to furnish every facility for academical and professional education without distinction of sex.

—Many strange things have been done, first and last, in the way of devising, and adapting, and modernizing some of the great books of the world. Shakspere has been Bowdlerized and, less offensively, Hudsonized. The 'Summa' of Thomas Aquinas has been put into doggerel Latin verse to be used as a cram book. Dante has been turned into quatrains, and Molière's "L'Avare" has been versified; the 'Contes' of Voltaire have been put into alexandrines, and the 'Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard' has been arranged in chapters and verses, like a Bible. The late Bishop Hopkins was once inspired to write a church history in the "common metre" of the hymn-books. But the latest venture of this kind, and the strangest, is surely that of a certain M. Boizomont, who has just produced an expurgated Rabelais —for the use of Sunday-schools, perhaps. Two or three times before now Rabelais has been put into modern French—once by the Chevalier Lureau, in 1849, and again by Prof. Martial Lureau. But these versions, it would seem, are completely overwhelmed and sunk when set beside the work of M. Boizomont, if one may judge from extracts from it which were given lately in the *Jour*. We can give but one specimen of it, and that shall be the well-known jest about Panurge's means of living. Rabelais says: "Toutefois, il avait soixante et trois manières d'en trouver toujours à son besoing, dont la plus honorable et la plus commune estoit par façon de larcin furtivement faict." This M. Boizomont turns thus: "C'était, toutefois, un invidu rempli de ressources, dont quelques-unes frisaient l'indélicatesse." This is the converse of a sea-change. Prof. Sophocles used to say sometimes that, if Virgil were obliged to restore what he had conveyed from Homer, there would be nothing left of him but the proper names; M. Boizomont leaves to Rabelais even a scantier residuum.

—The dynasty of the Mikados of Japan is the oldest in the world, being sentimentally 2556, and in historic certainty 1600 years old. A conspectus of their names, age at death, dates of reign, and order of succession may be seen on page 123 of 'The Mikado's Empire.' Now, however, it is possible at a glance of the eye to see the graphic counterfeits of six score or more men and women who have borne the title of Mikado. We have before us a sheet of heavy brocade paper (42x21 in.), on which are engraved the vignettes of 129 mikados; the ruling Emperor, Empress, and Crown Prince being in the centre. The sixteen divine progenitors of the line are set on either side of Ten Shō Dai Jin, or the sun-goddess, at the top, and all under the golden disc and rays of the sun. The portraits are printed on paper which has been first printed upon in banknote style with an engraved plate bearing tracery-work of clouds, dots and the *Kiri* (*Paulownia Imperialis*) leaf and flower—the Emperors' insignia. From the artistic, historic, archæologic, and purely contemporary points of view this publication is interesting and marks an epoch. The beings of "the divine age," as well as the first thirteen of the seventeen mikados to whom Occidental criticism refuses to ascribe historic reality, wear around their necks the *magatama*, or carved jewels which belong to the prehistoric era. These, now fossil or in museums, were often made of jade, which is not found in Japan, but only in China. The sun-goddess and the divine beings wear also the eight-pointed mirror on their breasts; and beneath the central lady, aureoled and flower surrounded, the ancestress of Everlasting great Japan, are the three sacred jewels or palladia—sword, crystal sphere, and metal mirror. Between the Empress of A.D. 1869-'96, in golden crown, low neck and short sleeves, Parisian coiffure, bodice, sash jewels and decorations, and the aureoled lady in *magatama* and unbound hair, there is suggestive but not unpleasing contrast. Considering the antiquity of Japanese art in both sketching, painting, and carving, credence can be given to most of these representations as portraits.

—The mutations of government, religion, and partisan politics are shown in the helmet and mail-clad warriors, the cowled and shaven-pated monks, the baby puppets, the girls and women, and in the varied degrees and insignia of rank and office held when promotion to the throne came. Nine of the mikados were women, the first (if we except Jingu—261-269 A. D.), being Suiko (593-628 A D.), and the last Go-Sakuramachi (1763-1770); two of the female emperors reigning twice. The Constitution of 1889 limits succession to the male line. The head-dresses and bust-costumes are a study to the archæologist, but the most striking point is the addition of the six "Northern" or "false emperors." These were the nominees of the Ashikaga shoguns during the civil war ("the war of the chrysanthemums") which desolated Japan from the year 1336 to 1392. Heretofore by most Japanese historians denied legitimacy, and their names printed in various styles of *odium typographicum* in the books, it is a sign of the times to see them here set with, though beneath, the recognized dynasty, and this with the permission of the censor. We hail it as a sign of increasing national pride, indeed, but of improved ethics in historiography. The number (121) of regular occupants of the throne is reached by omitting the names of Jingu, the Amazonian Empress and legendary conqueror of Korea, and one of the twice-reigning empresses. The average length of the reigns in the whole line is twenty-one years, or in the historic portion, fourteen years.

—The latest number of the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* shows that a pause in discovery at Delphi has been reached. There is, however, a rich harvest of material still to be threshed out; and of this process M. Homolle gives a valuable specimen in his restora-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and discussion of an inscription of the fifth century B. C., which is here photographed. It contains the regulations of the Delphic phratry of the Labyadæ, the conditions of admission into the community, the prescriptions for sacrificial ceremonies and for funeral rites, embracing even such details as the expense of funerals, the manner of laying out the dead, the times and places in which lamentation may be permitted during the burial ceremony. The inscription, with M. Homolle's discussion, throws new light on the Attic festival, the Apaturia, at which young men and married women were admitted to formal citizenship in their respective phratries; the most characteristic part of the ceremony being the cutting and the consecration of the hair—a rite practised by Semitic tribes on similar occasions. The language of the inscription is a highly interesting example of Delphic Dorian, illustrating certain forms in Hesiod, in Pindar, and in Theocritus, and retaining the digamma at the beginning of some words as well as a special sign for the rough breathing. M. de Ridder's elaborate report on the excavations at Orchomenus should be mentioned, but does not admit of summary. We may note, however, M. Chamounard's interesting description of the frieze of the temple of Hecate at Lagina in Caria, on account of its relation to the well-known sculpture of Pergamum. The fragments have been lately conveyed to the museum at Constantinople. They reveal an evident but awkward imitation of the famous Gigantomachy. The poses are borrowed from this; but the artist, not daring to attempt the bold and original pell-mell arrangement of the combatants, has reverted to the old-fashioned device of isolated groups of two adversaries. The monotony of this device is repeated in the details of armor, of gesture, and of costume. The workmanship is also somewhat rude and clumsy in many particulars. The date may be referred to the early part of the first century B. C., when, in all probability, the temple was repaired and restored, after the invasion of Mithridates, to commemorate Sylla's successes and to symbolize the protection of the Roman people toward the Carians, who had suffered for their fidelity to the Republic.

—The after-dinner amusements of the Greeks of the sixth century are suggested by a curious toy preserved in the Louvre and described and figured by M. E. Pottier. It consists of a seated satyr holding in front a crater-shaped vase, of Corinthian style and polychromy. The satyr has small perforations on the head and back, and his interior is so connected with the vase that his owner, whose name, Kolodon, is inscribed, could, by stopping one orifice or another with the finger, represent the satyr as alternately absorbing the wine or restoring it to the crater. This performance doubtless afforded a surprise and entertainment to his guests less likely to strain their intellects than the Platonic symposium; but it is further interesting as showing that some slight knowledge of the effects of air-pressure had reached the artisan class within a century of the date of Thales. A link in the history of ceramics is contributed by M. Joubin's discussion of a group of painted sarcophagi from Clazomenæ, two fine specimens of which are contained in the Louvre. They are decorated with animals painted in silhouette in a style resembling the early pottery of Camirus and Naucratis. Though belonging to the sixth century, they represent an Ionian tradition of animal decoration and painting in transparent silhouette which flourished as early as the eighth or ninth century, and was itself a development of the Mycenæan motives and technique. This Ionian style finally prevailed over the taste for geometric decoration, and restored the "Oriental style" to Rhodes, to Corinth, to Athens and Bœotia; and the sarcophagi of Clazomenæ may thus be regarded as the forerunners of the François vase.

HANS VON BÜLOW'S LETTERS.

Briefe und Schriften. Von Hans von Bülow. Vols. I., II. Leipzig and New York: Breitkopf & Härtel.

ALTHOUGH Hans von Bülow was considered one of the foremost pianists of his time, his best work lay in the line of orchestral and operatic conducting. Thirty years ago Wagner referred to him as the only conductor then living in whom he had full confidence, and showed that he meant what he said by choosing him to preside over the first performances ever given of "Tristan und Isolde" and "Die Meistersinger." In later years Bülow achieved unique fame in the concert hall by taking an ordinary orchestra and training it so thoroughly that he could play on it at will as on a piano. To posterity he will be chiefly known—since his own compositions are of no lasting value—as a pedagogue, by his admirable editing of various classical and romantic masters, and as a wit and letter-writer. In the latter capacity he has just become extensively known through the publication of two volumes of his correspondence, under the editorial supervision of his widow, the actress Marie Schanzer, whom he married twelve years after his divorce from Cosima Liszt, who subsequently became Wagner's wife. These volumes extend only from Bülow's eleventh year to his twenty-fifth (1841 to 1855), but it is announced that two further volumes, containing the best letters of the remaining thirty-nine years of his life, and a selection of his newspaper articles and musical essays will appear in the autumn. The editor not only has prefaced the first volume with a biographic sketch, but has added an occasional page of comment and footnotes where needed, so that this correspondence has the aspect and value of a complete autobiography.

Inasmuch as Bülow wrote enough letters in fourteen years to fill 900 printed pages (and many have been omitted or abbreviated), it is amusing to find him apologizing to Raff for his "unbounded indolence in letter-writing," in which indolence he boasts of having reached "a high degree of virtuosity." During all these years the world showed so little appreciation of his talent that he can hardly have thought that his letters would ever be printed, and there is no evidence anywhere that he wrote with an eye to such a contingency. He is known to have kept a diary, to which there are several allusions, but no trace of it remains. He was repeatedly urged to write his memoirs, but always replied that life was too short, and that it was better to let the past be past and devote one's time to new labors. The majority of the letters in these two volumes are addressed to his parents (who were divorced after 1849); other recipients are Liszt, Raff, Uhlig, Cornelius, Pohl, Radecke, Kroll, Ritter, Wieck. There are also printed here a few letters of Berlioz to Bülow, and of Wagner and Liszt to Bülow's parents. Those written in French are printed in that language. The footnotes are not obtrusively numerous; in one case, at any rate, an addition to their number would have been welcomed. Bülow states, under date of January 21, 1852, that he was carrying on, partly on his own behalf and partly for the busy Liszt, "a not very brisk but continuous correspondence with Wagner." What has become of these letters? Is the widow Cosima guarding them at Bayreuth, together with the three-volume autobiography of Wagner and other Nibelung treasures?

As might have been expected, the most interesting letters in the present collection are those relating to Bülow's intercourse with Wagner, whom he simply worshipped. It was Wagner's operas that induced him to give up the study of law and devote himself to music, even though by so doing he alienated the affection of his mother, so that she broke off all correspondence with him for half a year. He was only twelve years old when Wagner's music, in "Rienzi," first made an impression on him. At that time Italian opera was still a fashionable monopoly in the cities of Germany; from Stuttgart Bülow wrote to Wieck (Schumann's father-in-law) that "classical taste prevails here as little as in Dresden. Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, can be performed only in the absence of the King." Hans, as a boy, did not dislike the operas of Bellini and other Italians—indeed, he frequently refers to the "heavenly" pleasure they gave him; but at fourteen he had come to the conclusion that Mozart's "Don Juan" "is, after all, the opera of operas." Then followed his growing adoration of Wagner, to which there are numerous references. At seventeen he seems to have sent some of his own efforts at composition to Wagner, who delighted him with this amiable reply:

"Your pieces, my dear Mr. Bülow, have given me much pleasure; I was loath to send them back to you through your friend Ritter without enclosing a word of encouragement. A criticism I do not wish to add, nor is it necessary; you will find plenty of others ready to criticise you, and I feel the less disposed to enumerate flaws and details I do not like, because I can see from all the rest that you will soon be quite capable of criticising your own early efforts. Persevere in your efforts, and let me hear from you again soon."

To Ritter, Wagner said personally that Bülow's work showed "unmistakable talent." Such recognition from his idol was oil on the flames of his enthusiasm. In a letter to his mother he gives vent to his indignation on hearing that the famous poet Tieck had utterly condemned "Lohengrin" as a poem. If he remembered this indignation in later years, it must have gratified him to know that every child in Germany now knows "Lohengrin" by heart, and Tieck by name only, if at all. His friends did not share his admiration, for he tells us, on one occasion, how "Livia offered to go over 'Tannhäuser' with me, but she finds everything bad or crazy, while Waldemar usually leaves the room—in haste." Letter 37 (to his mother) is largely filled with lamentations because "Tannhäuser" was given in Dresden while he was in Leipzig. He would gladly have walked to Dresden had it been possible; and he adds:

"I thank God that, unlike the Pharisees, I am able to feel the holiness and divinity of the art of music as exemplified by this work, and to understand Wagner's mission as its apostle. I do not despise Wagner's enemies for this reason, unless they are guided by a personal prejudice; but I pity them for not being able to rise from the dust."

A few months later he again wrote to his mother, who had missed an opportunity or two to hear "Tannhäuser": "You will pardon me for saying so, but if I should hear that you

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had missed it again, I should be furious." On learning that "Lohengrin" might possibly have its first performance at Weimar, he wrote: "If that should happen, it would be a colossal thing, and Weimar would become the capital of the world"! In September, 1850, he went to Weimar to hear that opera, and when he found that the performance was postponed, he wrote: "You cannot possibly conceive my mortification; I wept in my disappointment and rage, and not in the privacy of my room, but right before Kroll's eyes." At last he heard the opera, and that sealed his fate. He took the diligence for Zurich, had an interview with Wagner, returned to his father, fell on his knees before him, and begged to be allowed to become a musician, under Wagner's guidance. The father consented on condition that his mother also would approve the step. So he wrote her a long letter, in which he explained that Wagner had proposed to him to come to Zurich and take part as pianist at the concerts and as assistant conductor at the opera there. Wagner himself wrote a long letter to his mother pleading for Hans. "I have observed," he says, "that your son's love for art, and especially for music, is not a mere fancy, but is based on great, nay, exceptional talent," adding that he had advised him also to continue his scientific studies, "because nothing is more unsympathetic to me than a learned musician without general culture." Liszt, too, pleaded for him, yet the mother remained obdurate; she feared that the rebel and revolutionist Wagner might corrupt her son's character. His father, in consequence, forbade him to even visit Wagner at Zurich. Wagner heard of this, and wrote to the father that, nevertheless, since he had discovered in Hans "an extraordinarily gifted and precocious artist," he sympathized with his desire, and was willing to risk his (the father's) displeasure, feeling sure that he would some day thank him for it. Hans had in the meantime been almost persuaded by his father's counsel to return to his legal studies in Berlin, when a letter from Wagner, which Ritter brought him, finally decided him. With Ritter he returned to Zurich, going on foot for two days and avoiding the public conveyances for fear of being pursued by his father.

Wagner welcomed his young pupil cordially and invited him daily to dinner, "which was always very good," Bülow writes, "as his wife is an accomplished cook." She also made herself useful by mending things for him, etc. He went to work at once rehearsing operas, concerning which he says: "It is not such an easy thing as it might seem; it requires a thorough study of the scores, amounting almost to a complete memorizing of them, and that is exhausting work." In another place he states that he is memorizing the "Freischütz," because such a work, where every detail is of importance, can be properly interpreted only if the conductor knows by heart every note, and does not need to look at the score. Some months later his placated father had the pleasure of seeing him, a youth of twenty, conducting an opera in that way without any assistance from the score; but the mother persisted in her resentment, as already stated, half a year, before the reports of his progress reconciled her partially to his chosen career.

That career, however, was by no means a bed of roses. There was a great deal of hard work to be done, in which Wagner usually took the lead. For instance, they devoted three days and evenings to correcting and arranging the score of "Don Juan" for performance. On this occasion Bülow was

"overcome with indignation in recollecting how Wagner's enemies at Dresden had said that he 'intentionally conducted Mozart's operas badly because he did not like them, but cared only for his own music.' I say, on the contrary, that none of these pseudo adorers of Mozart will ever be able to manifest such a warm, vital admiration and artistic intelligence as Wagner has shown by his unselfish devotion. It is clear that 'Don Juan,' as given to day everywhere, cannot produce the effect of which it is capable if his reforms are carried out."

In another place he writes regarding Wagner's editing of Gluck's "Iphigenia in Aulis":

"If he had never done anything but this work, so admirable from every point of view, his name would deserve to be held in the highest honor. To discover and learn to appreciate the significance of the details of his editing is in itself a rare pleasure. So far from showing a lack of respect for the great master whom he revised, Wagner has, on the contrary, given by his deed the noblest and most positive proof of his respect for him. True, the old maxim, *Quod licet Jovi non licet bovi*, remains in force."

Columns might be filled with similar outpourings of enthusiasm for Wagner as an artist and as a man—"the noblest, most amiable and adorable of men." He declares that his Wagner-worship is the best trait of his character; that he is proud of having been one of the first to recognize the genius and historic importance of the greatest artist of the century; that the possibility of being such a man's apostle gave an object and goal to his own life. "I love and respect him more every hour." "He has behaved toward me in such a kind, noble, fatherly way that I shall be eternally indebted to him. . . . In no case can my separation from Wagner be more than temporary." Unfortunately he was not able long to enjoy this friendly intercourse and artistic guidance. The most important singer in the Zurich company quarrelled with the young conductor, and her ultimatum was that one of the two must leave. So Bülow went to St. Gallen, where he presided over a small opera company, which gave him a great deal more experience than pleasure. The orchestra, it appears, consisted largely of amateurs—honest men, but poor players—and the hall used for rehearsing could not be heated, for economic reasons. The result—a performance of "The Daughter of the Regiment"—as described by him, is so amusingly and characteristically Bülowesque that it must be quoted in his own words:

"I had been unable to get a sufficient number of rehearsals, or all the necessary instruments, so that I had to make various changes to fill up the gaps. I was frightened to death as I stood at my desk, expecting every moment a fiasco, which did not fail to appear, not in the form of a collapse but of an ear-splitting cat's-music. I refused stubbornly to conduct the second act and was with difficulty persuaded to go on. After the performance I had a disagreeable scene with the manager, to whom I declared I was too good for such a piggery. . . . Such oxen as I had to deal with in this orchestra is beyond human experience to imagine. If I could only have made myself understood by these brutes! I would gladly have learned to grunt or bellow, but even that would have been useless."

His one consolation was that "one can learn more from a bad orchestra than from a good one." But he soon gave up this job and went to Weimar to study the piano with Liszt. The greater part of the two volumes is devoted to accounts of his intercourse with that great musician, who, as he told his mother, loved him like a son long before he became his father-in-law), and to his (Bülow's) pitiable and pathetic efforts to make his mark as a pianist. But we have quoted enough to show how entertaining these volumes are. It may be added that they are adorned by two portraits of Bülow, a facsimile of one of his letters, and several programmes. There is also a good index, and the book is beautifully printed; but it should not be bought unbound. Why do German publishers persist in putting together their unbound (and usually expensive) volumes so that they come to pieces after a few hours' use? The ten-cent books of our department dry-goods stores are better stitched.

ORIGIN OF THE FRANCO GERMAN WAR.—II.

Die Begründung des Deutschen Reichs durch Wilhelm I. Von Heinrich von Sybel. Siebenter Band. Munich: R. Oldenbourg; New York: Westermann.

THE French have always maintained that the candidacy of Prince Leopold was the result of a Prussian intrigue; that Bismarck started it in order to provoke France to war. All the evidence, as Sybel points out, goes to show that the first thought of the candidacy was purely Spanish. He shows also that the offer of the crown was three times refused by the Prince, with the assent of his father and the approval of King William; that, in 1869, Bismarck also advised refusal; that Leopold's acceptance of the fourth offer, in June, 1870, was given without King William's knowledge or approval, although, when notified of the Prince's decision, the King declared that he would interpose no objection. Sybel also insists, as the Germans have always insisted, on the fact that the authority of King William over this remotely related South German branch of the family was not such that he could forbid Leopold's acceptance of a foreign crown. On the other hand, Sybel himself states that when a "family council" was held at Berlin, in March, 1870, to consider the third offer, Bismarck strongly urged the acceptance of the candidacy; that its rejection for the third time, early in May, when he was lying ill at Varzin, was a disappointment to him; that he wrote to Gen. Prim, at the end of May, that the candidacy was an excellent thing which must be kept in view, but that negotiations should not be carried on with the Prussian Government but with Prince Leopold. Sybel leaves it to be inferred that the fourth offer was due to this encouragement, and he indicates that the Prince's acceptance was largely due to Bismarck's arguments. The Rumanian revelations do not in any way contradict Sybel's story. They simply give additional evidence of Bismarck's interest in the candidacy. In March, 1870, Prince Charles of Rumania notes, in his diary, that Bismarck has submitted to King William a memorial urging the acceptance of the candidacy. On the 26th of March, Prince Antony writes: "Bismarck is very ill content with the failure of the Spanish combination." Early in June Prince Charles notes that Leopold is beginning to regard it as his duty to accept the Spanish crown. Prince Antony has informed the Prussian Crown Prince of this change of sentiment, with the suggestion that it be made known to Bismarck. The latter, on receiving this information, has written to Prince Antony urging him to persuade his son to accept. Privy Councillor Bucher and Major von Versen "have brought back" very satisfactory accounts of the prospects of the candidacy in the Spanish Cortes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in the country. The final offer and acceptance, Delbrück concludes, were obviously the work of these Prussian agents. Writing for Germans, Delbrück does not think it necessary to point out that Lothar Bucher, the ex-revolutionist, was one of Bismarck's most trusted assistants in the Prussian Foreign Office.

Sybel holds strongly to the position that the candidacy was really a family matter, with which Prussia and the Prussian Government, as such, had nothing to do. Delbrück admits that this is technically true, but maintains that the opposite view, the French view, is substantially just. Sybel insists that the matter was never laid before the Prussian ministry; Bismarck was called into the family council not as Prussian Premier, but as King William's personal adviser. Delbrück points out that at the most important meeting of this family council not only Bismarck, but his under-secretary, three other Prussian ministers, and Moltke were present, all of whom favored the acceptance of the candidacy.

As regards Bismarck's motives, Sybel declares himself incompletely informed. He says, however, that Bismarck explained his change of views by pointing out that in 1869 Spain was in a very disturbed condition; that the subsequent suppression of the Carlist and Republican movements had strengthened the Government and created a firmer basis for a new throne. Sybel conjectures that Bismarck anticipated political and commercial advantages from the establishment of a German prince upon the Spanish throne—a conjecture which Prince Antony's letters show to be correct. That Bismarck did not expect that the candidacy would cause war between France and Germany is affirmed by both Sybel and Delbrück. As they both point out, there was really reason to anticipate that Leopold might secure the throne without decided opposition from Napoleon. The Sigmaringen princes were more closely connected with the Bonapartes than with the house of Prussia, and the French Emperor was well-disposed towards them. He had supported the candidacy of Charles for the throne of Rumania. He had indicated no personal opposition to Leopold's candidacy, although he was aware of the negotiations. He had only indicated, through Benedetti, that the French people would resent it. The French people, however, had already resented many things which Napoleon had decided to tolerate. Confronted with the *fait accompli*, he might accept it; the more willingly because the only important rival candidacy, that of the Orleanist Duc de Montpensier, was regarded by him as "anti dynastic." Should he object, however, there need be no trouble. Bismarck's treatment of the whole question as a matter between the Spanish Government and Prince Leopold, in which the Prussian King was interested only as head of the house of Hohenzollern, and in which he had only advice to give, not commands, left the road open, as Delbrück reminds us, to a withdrawal by the Prince himself, in which Prussia would appear as little concerned as in his candidacy.

Further than this Delbrück does not go, and it is hardly to be expected that a good Prussian should go further. Outsiders, however, may naturally inquire whether Bismarck's mind was not probably running beyond this point. It would be absurd to attribute to him any accurate forecast of the extraordinary blunders of which the French Government was afterwards guilty; but it does not seem too much to say that he must have realized that, if France decided to object, the controversy would require careful handling by the French Government, and might be mismanaged. Of Napoleon's ability Bismarck had a low opinion; years before he had confidentially described the French Emperor as "une grande incapacité méconnue." Of Gramont he had frankly remarked in 1866, "He is the greatest blockhead (*Dummkopf*) in Europe." The appointment of Gramont, of course, was made after the Berlin "family council," but it was prior to Bismarck's successful effort to revive the candidacy and to secure Prince Leopold's acceptance of the fourth offer. If, as Bismarck had steadily declared since 1866, he believed war with France to be inevitable; if, as Delbrück insists, and we may readily believe, he apprehended an alliance between France, Austria, and Italy, and the outbreak of war at the time and on the issue which should best suit these Powers, it is not incredible that it seemed to him good policy to create a situation from which Prussia could not well draw disadvantage, and which might cause France to strike prematurely and under circumstances which would alienate the sympathies of Europe. Such a line of reasoning would have required no greater foresight and power of combination than were exhibited by Bismarck in the Schleswig-Holstein imbroglio in 1864. If he considered these possibilities, it is most improbable that he discussed them; and it may be set down as certain that he did not unbosom himself to King William. Sybel and Delbrück agree that in the "family council" no mention was made of a possible objection from the French Government.

In describing the events from the 3d to the 15th of July, Sybel maintains that neither Napoleon nor Ollivier desired war; and that Gramont, although the intemperance of his declarations and despatches made the preservation of peace extremely difficult, probably desired at the outset only to inflict upon Prussia a diplomatic defeat. This he really had in his grasp when, in the absence of Prince Leopold, Prince Antony withdrew his son's candidacy. It was, of course, a disappointment that King William had refused to command or even counsel the withdrawal; but the King's complaisance in discussing the matter with Benedetti—a course which Bismarck strongly disapproved—the King's admission that he had given a passive approval to the candidacy, his further admission that he was in communication with Prince Antony, and his statement that if Leopold withdrew he would approve the withdrawal—concessions which caused Bismarck to think of resigning—all this left it open to France to assert and to Europe to believe that Prince Antony's action was really the result of the pressure brought to bear on King William. At this point Gramont made his great blunder. Instead of contenting himself with what he had gained, he undertook to increase his diplomatic triumph over the good-natured and pacific King. He suggested to Werther, the Prussian Ambassador at Paris, that the King should send to the Emperor a letter explaining that he had not imagined that the candidacy would arouse such opposition in France, and he gave Werther a draft of such a letter. Gramont afterwards protested against this being called a "lettre d'excuse"; but he prints the draft in his book, and it is not easy to see how it could be regarded as anything else. He then, with the concurrence of Napoleon—obtained, according to Sybel, only because the Emperor was prostrated by one of the attacks to which he was subject—directed Benedetti to obtain from King William a distinct pledge that he would not permit the candidacy to be renewed. In view of the King's repeated declarations that he could not forbid the candidacy, it seems impossible that Gramont should have expected to obtain such a pledge. He asserted, however, that he did expect it. Meanwhile, the news of these additional demands had produced a decided revulsion in the sentiment of Europe, which up to this point had been almost wholly in favor of France. The English ambassador protested; the Austrian premier, Beust, sent an energetic remonstrance. At this, Gramont himself wavered, and the French cabinet had virtually decided to abandon the demand for guarantees of the future, when the news of Bismarck's action turned the scale for war.

Bismarck, as we have seen, was far from satisfied with King William's diplomacy. He solicited and received a summons to join the King at Ems. Reaching Berlin on the 12th, he was met by the news of the withdrawal of the candidacy. Regarding the episode as closed, he decided to remain in Berlin, at least for the night. On the 13th he received information of the additional satisfaction required by France. He at once explained to the English Ambassador, Lord Loftus, that the action of the French Government clearly showed that the candidacy of Leopold had been merely the pretext for a quarrel; that Prussia must now demand explanation, satisfaction, and guarantees from France. He telegraphed to Werther that his conduct in entertaining Gramont's demand for an apology was not approved, and directed him to take leave of absence on the ground of ill-health. At six in the evening, sitting at dinner with Moltke and Roon, he received a telegram from Ems, announcing the presentation of the French demand that King William should not permit the renewal of the candidacy, and the King's refusal to bind himself "à tout jamais." After this interview, the King had received from Prince Antony the formal notice of the withdrawal of the candidacy. As the King had promised Benedetti to inform him of any such communication, a consultation was held as to whether the French Ambassador should be admitted to another interview. In view of what had passed in the morning, it was decided that the news from Prince Antony should be conveyed by an adjutant, who should inform Benedetti that the King had nothing more to say.

The despatch closed with the suggestion, on the part of the King, that Benedetti's new demand and the King's refusal should be communicated to the Prussian legations and to the press. This suggestion Bismarck proceeded to carry out in the most literal fashion, drafting a report which recited, with perfect accuracy, Benedetti's demand and the King's refusal to grant a further audience. The omission of all the intermediate details contained in the telegrams of course gave Bismarck's abstract a very different tone. There was a suggestion of a more abrupt termination of intercourse than had really occurred. Roon said: "That sounds better." Moltke added: "It sounded before like a signal for parley (*chamade*); now it sounds like a fanfare." Delbrück adds that when, the next morning, King William saw Bismarck's dispatch on the bulletin board, he read it carefully twice, and said: "That means war." Sybel and Delbrück agree in treating the French charge of "forgery" with contempt. Sybel remarks that the details telegraphed from Ems were for Bismarck's information only; that it would have been improper to publish them. Delbrück takes higher ground; he maintains that Bismarck's report gave a truer picture of what had happened

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the longer original telegram. The King and the Ambassador had of course conducted themselves like gentlemen. Champions of opposed causes do not open a conflict to-day, as the Homeric heroes did, with reciprocal discourtesies. In the broader sense, however, Benedetti's famous statement that nobody was insulted at Ems is untrue. The German nation was insulted by the substance of the French demands. The attitude of the French Government throughout the controversy represented the tradition of a French primacy in Europe, and this tradition Germany could no longer accept. Under the form of a question of national etiquette lay, in reality, the question that had been awaiting solution since Sadowa.

On the 13th the French Cabinet was informed of King William's refusal to give the desired pledge; but this refusal had already, so to say, been discounted; and it seems that the Ministers as well as the Emperor were still disposed to accept the situation and terminate the controversy. On the 14th such a course seemed to them impossible. The compulsory furlough given to Werther, the publication of King William's refusal to hold further conference with Benedetti, had abruptly changed the aspect of affairs. It was no longer possible to regard Prussia as having submitted to a diplomatic humiliation. The use which Bismarck had made of Gramont's mistakes had completely turned the tables. To preserve peace, France must now back down, as was clearly indicated in Bismarck's conversation with Lord Loftus. Had the French Ministers already heard of this conversation? Sorel long ago conjectured that they had. Sybel thinks the assumption impossible. Delbrück gives reasons for thinking that the report might have come to them by way of Vienna. With or without this last incentive, the Government resolved upon war, and on the following day war was declared.

Ever since this war the French have been looking for a scapegoat. Sybel's whole narrative seems intended to direct their choice to Gramont. He maintains that Gramont withheld important information from his colleagues and the Emperor; that at one critical moment, at least, he disregarded their decision; that he made false statements to the Deputies. There were moments, Sybel thinks, at which he shrank from the responsibility he was incurring, but the popular passions which he had been largely instrumental in arousing were too strong for him to resist. Gramont started his brief and disastrous diplomatic campaign on the assumption that the Spanish candidacy was the work of Prussia; he concluded it and plunged France into war on the assumption that Austria and Italy, although bound by no formal treaty, would take up arms for France. Both of these assumptions Sybel regards as baseless, and ascribes to Gramont's "constructive imagination."

Delbrück insists that both assumptions were justified. As regards the first point, we cannot but agree with him. As regards the second and more important point, Delbrück not only maintains, as we have seen, that the understanding between the three sovereigns was a complete one, but asserts that, even after the declaration of war, it was in Napoleon's power to convert the informal understanding into a binding treaty. Why, then, was this not done? Bismarck once said that, even after the declaration of war, Prussia could have made peace with France if the Prussian Government had been willing to sacrifice Belgium. In return for this concession, Prussia would have obtained free hand in South Germany. With a million of men under arms, the two Powers could have imposed their will upon Europe. This, Delbrück believes, was really Napoleon's plan, and this explains his postponement of a definite agreement with Austria. He wished to hold himself free to the last possible moment for such an arrangement with Prussia. For all this, however, Delbrück has no other evidence than Bismarck's statement, which does not go nearly so far. Even if Bismarck meant to say that a proposition of this sort was actually made by Napoleon, it does not follow that Napoleon's whole policy was meant to lead up to and culminate in such a proposal. Delbrück's theory would do very well in an historical romance; in the present state of our knowledge it is out of place in an historical essay.

As regards the serious part of Delbrück's criticism, the difference between his views and Sybel's rests mainly on their different interpretations of the material furnished by Beust, Vitzthum, Prince Napoleon, General Lebrun, and others of less note. Lebrun's recent revelations, published since Sybel wrote, tend to support Delbrück's contentions, but they are not conclusive. They are not irreconcilable with Sybel's theory that the Austrian Government, though really resolved upon peace, was temporizing with Napoleon, ready to join him if victory seemed assured, but determined not to be involved with him in a common disaster. As to Italy, both writers agree that Victor Emmanuel wished to support Napoleon, but that his ministers were of a different opinion; and both agree that Italy's action was practically dependent upon Austria's. Delbrück, we think, underrates the influence of the Roman question in preventing concerted action by the three Powers—an influence which Prince Napoleon declares to have been decisive. Delbrück also makes too little of the restraint imposed upon Austria by the menacing attitude of Russia.

In this concluding volume of Sybel's great work, as in the sixth, we miss the certainty of tone which characterized the first five, and which resulted from the use of the Prussian archives—a privilege accorded to him until 1890 and then withdrawn. We find, however, the same breadth of view and felicitous clearness of presentation; and these two last volumes will always have the value of a contemporary account by an historian of the first rank, to whom sources of information were open that were inaccessible to nearly all others. In these volumes, for example, he cites verbal communications from persons of no less consequence than the Crown-Prince Frederick and the Emperor Napoleon.

The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors. By John Brown, B.A., D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1895. Pp. v, 368.

ENGLISH writers have naturally essayed the story of Congregational beginnings less frequently than American students; and a volume on this theme by a prominent English Congregationalist therefore appeals to a home public less acquainted with the details of colonial history than are readers on this side of the Atlantic, while its angle of view is likely to be sufficiently unfamiliar to awaken the interest of the American into whose hands it falls, even though the facts that it presents are for the most part well known. Such a volume is that in which Dr. Brown of Bedford traces the Congregational movement down to the union of the four New England colonies in 1643. Its attractiveness has been enhanced by a number of illustrations of scenes and buildings associated with the English experiences of the Plymouth Pilgrims, drawn by Charles Whymper; and the printed sheets imported by the American publishers are prefaced with an introduction by the Rev. Dr. A. E. Dunning of Boston as the volume is put forth in this country.

Dr. Brown's work is an exceedingly readable narrative, written in a style that sometimes savors a little of the lecture-platform, but is never dull. It exhibits, especially in the portion which has to do with experiences in England, wide reading and much skill in the presentation of facts. The chapters which set forth the life that centred about Scrooby and the persons engaged in founding the Pilgrim church are noteworthy, and evidence much acquaintance with the scenes described. The early experiences of the Plymouth colonists, including the not very remarkable adventures of their first exploring parties, are told with fulness from the pages of Mourt's 'Relation' and Bradford's History. Indeed, by far the greater portion of Dr. Brown's book is devoted to the story of Pilgrim life—no less than 225 of the 343 pages of his text being occupied with the narrative of the Scrooby company from its beginnings to De Rasières's visit in 1627.

This apportionment compresses the sections of Dr. Brown's volume which relate to the Puritan colonies into disproportionate narrowness, and these chapters are the least satisfactory in the book, probably because the author is on less familiar ground. A New Englander will be provoked to a smile when Dr. Brown tells him that "no one living now" can read Eliot's Indian Bible, or that the Concord of which Peter Bulkeley was the first minister was "on the banks of the Merrimac." But such slips are not many, and the volume may be commended as a vivacious presentation of the external features of the early Congregational movement.

What the reader misses most in Dr. Brown's pages is a clear presentation of the causes of that movement itself. Congregationalism was something much more definite than "the struggle for spiritual freedom on English soil," though Dr. Brown fails to make it evident that such was the case, and begins his account of the precursors of the Pilgrim Fathers with the weavers condemned by the Council of Oxford in 1165, William of Occam, and Wyclif. The nearest approach to a statement of the religious principles which underlay the Pilgrim enterprise is in his summary of Robinson's controversial volumes in the chapter on Robinson's writings, and in his account of the formation of the Salem church after the story of Plymouth has been fully told. Such an omission is a distinct loss of force to the impression which the narrative makes.

In his preface, Dr. Brown remarks, "Where one has been making notes extending over a lengthened period, it is not always easy to remember the source from which many points of detail were taken." The discriminating reader, without thereby refusing hearty recognition to the substantial merits of the volume under review, will regret the absence of the customary signs of quotation from some passages where they might appropriately have been employed.

Recollections of Lord Coleridge. By W. P. Fishback. Indianapolis: The Bowen-Merrill Company. 1895.

THE circumstances under which the author of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this volume established an acquaintance with the late Lord Coleridge have never hitherto been clearly understood by the world. Indeed, it is highly probable that the existence of this acquaintance was known to few, and in a short time it might have become impossible to procure sufficient evidence to establish it as an historical event, while its details would have been irretrievably lost. This danger, we can assure our readers, is now averted. Mr. Fishback lays before us an array of facts sufficient to strike scepticism dumb. The acquaintance was brought about by means of a letter of introduction from Mr. Justice Harlan of the United States Supreme Court, to whom Mr. Fishback very properly dedicates this book. The presentation of this letter drew forth a reply from Lord Coleridge which is printed in the text and a facsimile of which appears in the appendix, including the letterhead of crest and motto. This must be accepted as conclusive proof of the existence of the letter, as well as of the invitation to dinner that it contained.

It may well be that future historians would not have hesitated to infer on general principles that such an invitation was accepted; but the array of facts is enough to make it unnecessary to resort to presumptions. The very hour of the dinner is named, and the fact that the Lord Chancellor was late, owing to his having been kept at the House of Lords until the Duke of Argyll yielded the floor, is a most convincing bit of circumstantial evidence. Then it is quite incredible that in a spurious narrative Lord Coleridge should be represented as answering the inquiry—"Was Mr. Arnold true to his teachings as the apostle of the gospel of sweetness and light?"—with "Perfectly and always." Such conversation as this cannot have been invented. We could easily point out a number of other details of most persuasive character, but it would require the patience of a Paley to demonstrate the cogency of these cumulative probabilities. On the whole, we incline to think that when posterity shall undertake to reconstruct our life, the Fishback-Coleridge intimacy will be recognized as one of the best authenticated facts in history.

We cannot let it be supposed that Mr. Fishback dined with Lord Coleridge but once. Thrice, as we reckon, did they dine, and twice take luncheon together. Moreover, the number of notes and letters received by Mr. Fishback from Lord Coleridge must have been at least ten, besides one from his brother-in-law—the letters themselves in great part being produced in evidence. On one or more occasions Mr. Fishback occupied a chair beside Lord Coleridge as he sat on the bench, and by his special invitation. We are bound to add that Mr. Fishback reports some conversations with the Chief Justice which are interesting, and that he has some good stories to tell, new as well as old.

We have perhaps said enough to suggest that entertainment is to be had from this book, and we cannot find it in our heart to speak altogether harshly of any writer who promotes hilarity among mankind. Whatever his weaknesses may be, Mr. Fishback is an intelligent observer, and many of his reflections on ways American and English indicate a broad and genial nature. His style is clear and flowing, his book is charmingly printed, and the Coleridge crest and motto are stamped on its cover.

Early Rhode Island Houses: An Historical and Architectural Study. By Norman M. Isham, A.M., Instructor in Architecture, Brown University, and Albert F. Brown, Architect. Providence: Preston & Rounds. 1895. Small 4to, pp. 100 and 60 plates.

THE preface of this very interesting book closes with an expression of the hope that it will be found to supplement, by "accurate measured drawings," what are properly called the "vague descriptions of too many of our town histories." This it will surely do. It will also serve to supplement and complete the rather numerous books on "old colonial" architecture which have been published within a few years. Those books are almost wholly confined to free-hand drawings of details intended chiefly for daily consumption in the architect's office, and photographic process prints of exteriors. They are also devoted to the more elaborate structures of the period before 1800. The book before us, however, is devoted to serious study of humbler and therefore more purely traditional and, in a sense, autochthonous buildings. It takes up two houses of the period before 1675, five of the next twenty-five years, and four more of the quarter-century before 1725—all in the region of northern Rhode Island; and these it treats in an exhaustive manner with drawings of what exists, drawings of restoration, and descriptive text.

"Northern Rhode Island" is not a large district, and none of the old houses which our authors have discovered there are elaborate, or offer details which the modern architect is likely to convey. Their interest for the student of architecture is in the simplicity and freedom of their design, the traditional and unschooled work of the village carpenter. In this respect they are a most valuable help to an understanding of the natural evolution of architecture, and of the architecture that was so brought into being, whether before or after the fifteenth century. Besides the houses of the Providence region, to which the book is especially devoted, those of Newport are treated in chapter v., and those of "the Narragansett country" in chapter vi. Chapter vii. is given up to construction. In this the analysis of the framing in the old houses is of extraordinary value, and the seven plates which illustrate it, Nos. 54 to 60, are excellent in their intention and almost all that could be asked in execution. This book is probably the most valuable historic architectural treatise that has as yet appeared in America.

The Utopia of Sir Thomas More, in Latin from the edition of March, 1518, and in English from the first edition of Ralph Robynson's translation in 1551, with additional translations. Introduction and notes by J. H. Lupton, B.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1895.

Thomas Morus Utopia. Herausgegeben von V. Michelis und T. Ziegler. Berlin: Weidmann. 1895.

THE unfailing interest of Thomas More's brilliant sketch of the ideal state is again proved by the appearance almost simultaneously of an English and a German edition. The former, in a stately volume of three hundred and fifty pages, gives the text from the Basle edition of Frobenius published in March, 1518. The editor explains his choice of this, the third, edition as that one among the very earliest which most nearly represents the author's own wishes. On the other hand, he has taken the earliest edition of Robynson's translation for two apparently very good reasons—one, that it has never before been reprinted, and the other, that, just because it is the earliest, it best gives the flavor of antiquity which is its especial charm. We have here also a short but carefully written introduction, giving a sketch of More's life and of the circumstances under which the 'Utopia' was produced, together with an account of the several editions, and a comparison of the 'Utopia' with other sketches of ideal commonwealths, both earlier and later. The editor comes to a very sensible conclusion in regard to the seriousness of More's intentions. So far as the general idea of bringing out into bold relief many of the political, religious, social, and economic evils of his own time is concerned, the purpose is a perfectly serious one. To suppose, however, that More wished to present a serious solution of these difficulties, such as might be put into execution by practical reformers, is to ignore the character of the man and the real significance of his place in literature. His seriousness is that of the man of imagination, whose vision of the future wanders on in half-playful fancies, which are seen to be prophetic only when they have been realized by the very unimaginative logic of events.

Besides the letters about the 'Utopia,' which were given in translation by Robynson, Mr. Lupton prints and translates three others, one by Erasmus to the printer Frobenius, one by Budæus to Thomas Lupset, a young Englishman, who had published a rather hastily prepared edition of the 'Utopia' in Paris in 1517, and one by Busleyden to More. The text, especially that of the translation, is beautifully printed, and is accompanied by very full and scholarly notes. A glossary of old English words and a thorough index are added to make this the most complete and useful edition of the 'Utopia' now to be had.

Quite different in outward appearance is the modest German edition, a cheap little paper volume containing only the Latin, and that from the earliest edition of 1516, corrected, however, by comparison with that of Frobenius. The editors agree with Mr. Lupton in thinking that this later edition had probably the advantage of More's personal corrections. A careful introduction concerns itself chiefly with the question, how far More was an imitator of Plato, and how far he was an independent and even a distinctly modern man; with a very decided leaning toward the latter view. The text is neatly printed, uniform in its style with the series of "Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler des xv. and xvi. Jahrhunderts," of which it forms a part.

The Last Cruise of the Miranda. By Henry Collins Walsh. New York: Transatlantic Publishing Co. 1896. 8vo, pp. 232. With many illustrations.

IN 1894 Dr. F. A. Cook organized an excursion party to Greenland from New York, purposing to visit the glaciers and Melville Bay, touch at Peary's camp, hunt, study Eskimo, and have a good time generally. The plan was a good one, provided proper attention had been given to details necessary for such a cruise. First of all a suitable vessel was needed. When it is explained that an iron tramp steamer was selected, no one who knows anything about navigation in Arctic waters will be surprised at the subsequent experiences of the party. The *Miranda* left New York July 7 with a large company on board, including several well-known men of science, geologists, zoölogists, literary men, and travellers. They touched at North Sydney and St. John's, Newfoundland, and on the 17th ran into an iceberg, crushing in the bows of the vessel and necessitating a return to St. John's for repairs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some of the party decided to confine their explorations to dry land for the rest of the season, but on the 28th of July the *Miranda* with the others made a fresh start for South Greenland. After an unsuccessful attempt to reach Frederikshaab, the expedition brought up at Sukkertoppen, where several days were spent agreeably. In endeavoring to proceed to Disco the *Miranda* ran upon a reef and seriously injured her bottom. By great good luck the American fishing schooner *Rigel* of Gloucester was finally communicated with and induced to give up her voyage, take the party on board, and accompany the unseaworthy steamer to a port of repair. For this service the sum of $4,000 was agreed upon, being a fare of about $53 per head. On the 21st of August the two vessels left Greenland. Two days later the steamer was abandoned in a sinking condition, and with her loss the legal claim of the rescuing fishermen for remuneration also vanished. On the 5th of September the party were landed in North Sydney by Capt. Dixon, who seems to have done all that man could do for his unfortunate passengers. The owners of the *Miranda* stood on their legal rights and declined to pay the salvage, but contributed $250 to a subscription which was made by the party, the total amounting to about half the original contract. Mr. Walsh states:

"This little volume has been issued in the hope that the profits arising from its sale may at least amount to a fair portion of the balance morally, if not legally, due to the Captain and the crew of the *Rigel*."

The party divided at North Sydney, a portion of them leaving Halifax for New York on the steamer *Portia*, and, as if their previous adventures were not enough, off Cuttyhunk in a fog the *Portia* ran down and sank the schooner *Dora French*, by which four lives were lost.

Fourteen of the party, including Professors Brewer of Yale and G. F. Wright of Oberlin, have contributed to the book, which is profusely illustrated. While rather a record of adventure than a contribution to geography, Mr. Walsh's narrative is lively and interesting, and many of the pictures are excellent. In an Arctic library the book's chief use will be to point the very obvious moral implied in the inscription said to have adorned a sawmill, "Don't monkey with the buzz-saw."

From Manassas to Appomattox: Memoirs of the Civil War in America. By James Longstreet, Lieutenant-General Confederate Army. Illustrated. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 8vo, pp. xxii, 690.

Few if any corps commanders on either side in our civil war had so long or so continuous field service as Gen. Longstreet. He was commandant of a brigade in the first battle of Bull Run, and more than half of all who surrendered with Lee at Appomattox were under his orders. With Stonewall Jackson he shared the honor of being Lee's principal subordinate, and for energy in field fighting he was brilliantly conspicuous throughout the war. He served continuously with the Army of Northern Virginia except when sent to reinforce Bragg prior to the battle of Chickamauga, and in that sanguinary engagement he commanded the left wing of the Confederate army, whose fortune it was to break and roll back Rosecrans's right. The winter campaign in East Tennessee against Burnside, in which Knoxville was besieged, was made by Longstreet with a small army detached from Bragg. This was Longstreet's only service as an independent commander; and though unsuccessful, it is doubtful if success in the peculiar task assigned him was possible for any one. The spring of 1864 found him close to the Virginia boundary, and he was recalled to Lee's army in the general concentration of forces preliminary to the great campaigns which were to end the war.

In this long and arduous service Longstreet established a reputation for impetuous courage, united with cool-headed composure and tactical judgment on the field, second to none. His capacity to command as general-in-chief of a large army was not tested fully, and no discussion is more useless than that which deals with the probable success in independent commands of men whose work has been subordinate. When peace came, he established himself as a cotton-factor in New Orleans, and, for a time, business success seemed likely to compensate him for the loss of his military position. In 1867, however, he declared in favor of Southern acceptance of the logical results of the war, including the political enfranchisement of the freedmen. This was followed by ostracism on the part of his old friends, which quickly caused his business ruin. His conscientiousness was proved by the fact that, both then and since, he showed no political aspirations, nor has he sought to make profit by his change of party associations. The modest office of Surveyor of Customs was bestowed upon him by Gen. Grant unasked, moved by his personal generosity.

To the political enmities thus engendered, Gen. Longstreet attributes the attacks upon his military fame which have since been made by officers who served with him in the Confederate army; and the circumstances seem to justify him in doing so. The form of these attacks, however, has generally been that of depreciation. No one has ventured to deny his lion-like courage, his power to discipline his troops and to infuse his own invincible energy into them, or his devotion to the cause he was almost the last to despair of. But they say he was slow in the beginnings of action, that he was stubborn in sticking to his own ideas, and that thus he thwarted his chief and was the proximate cause of disaster on notable occasions, especially at the battle of Gettysburg.

While, therefore, General Longstreet's memoirs cover the whole period of his military career, we find, as we might expect, that his vindication from aspersion becomes the most stimulating part of his book. As to the battle of Seven Pines in front of Richmond, his chief critic was General G. W. Smith, who succeeded to the Confederate command in the interval between the disabling of General Johnston and the appointment of Lee to the vacant place. Longstreet, who commanded the right wing, not only narrates fully the progress of the battle from his standpoint, and argues for the intelligent generalship with which the plans of the General-in-chief were carried out on the right, but he uses his old aggressive tactics, and turns the tables on his critic by asserting that it was the feeble and timid conduct of the left, where Smith commanded in person, that prevented a decisive success for the Confederate arms.

As to Gettysburg, the dispute hinges upon the orders for the second day, when, it is asserted, Lee commanded an attack at sunrise by Longstreet, who did not make it till afternoon. Longstreet peremptorily denies that such an order was issued, asserts that Lee knew that the troops could not possibly reach the field and attack at any such hour, gives evidence that the contingency on which Lee ordered any attack did not occur till late in the forenoon, and that Lee personally and by his staff controlled the preliminary movements, which extended far beyond the time at which it was pretended the attack was to be made. Events on other parts of the field are made to throw light upon and to support his case. His principal critics here have been Gens. Early, Pendleton, and Fitzhugh Lee.

In the West he condemns the generalship of Bragg at and after Chickamauga, and especially the separation of his own troops from Bragg's army when Grant was preparing for the aggressive campaign of Missionary Ridge. The forces with him, he asserts, were too few for a quick and successful *coup de main* against Burnside, yet so many as to imperil by their absence the position of the main army, and so gave to Grant double chances of victory.

As the criticisms upon Longstreet impugn the value of his services to his chief, it was natural that he should give the evidence of Lee's confidence in him as a soldier and his trust in him as a faithful comrade and friend. The frank and free correspondence between them seems to establish this beyond reasonable controversy. It is not too much to say that Lee had fullest faith in Longstreet's ability and character. He listened to his subordinate's suggestions with respect, and continuously intrusted to him large responsibilities in the execution of his plans. When Longstreet had been separated from the Virginia army, Lee welcomed him back to his old place with a cordiality which left no room to doubt the confidence between them. At Appomattox itself Lee delayed his own consent to consider the necessity of surrender till Longstreet was convinced that the last hope was gone.

The memoir is a work without which the literature of the war would be incomplete. The personal views of so prominent a character are part of the evidence which cannot be spared. The revelations of his own character are a great help in judging of every event in which he had a part. His methods of action and of thought, his canons of military judgment, his influence upon officers and men, are all worthy of careful study, because his prominent position made them all factors in the results of the campaigns in which he fought. It is impossible within the limits of this notice to examine all the evidence which the official records contain, and to attempt to judge adequately the controversies between Longstreet and his critics. That will be the work of historians in the future. But it is safe to say that no investigator will fail to reckon the memoir among the most important sources of information on which the history of the Confederacy must be built.

It is evident that Longstreet has not availed himself of literary help as much as in some former papers of his which have been published. His book is not as smooth in style as those papers, but it gains as a personal presentation of himself. His very mannerisms are characteristic and smack of the camp. Blunt, careless, sometimes even egotistic, he "says his say" with a kind of defiant earnestness which commands attention and rouses sympathy. The references in footnotes to the official records are made under the name of 'Rebellion Record,' which is somewhat misleading, since there is a well-known and voluminous private publication with that name, and the author's intention is to refer to the 'Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies,' published by the Government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Molecules and the Molecular Theory of Matter. By A. D. Risteen. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1895. Pp. 223.

MR. RISTEEN'S object is to give, in elementary form, a complete and connected account of what is known of the constitution of matter. Such a book has long been wanting, for a very good reason—namely, that there are few physicists who are not painfully aware how far they fall short of competence to produce such a treatise. In the main, Mr. Risteen has done very well. He has taken account of almost all the greater contributions, mathematical and experimental; he has so put them together as to render his pages intensely interesting, by virtue of the thread of cunning reasoning and apposite observation that surely leads to the heart of the great puzzles which he follows out; and he argues some points with real power. The work will prove extremely useful to all who wish to know what the scientific theory of molecules is in detail, and what are the grounds upon which it rests.

The great memoir of Helmholtz upon the conservation of force assumes that all material forces are between pairs of particles—in short, are attractions and repulsions. But measurements upon the elasticity of bodies have thrown grave doubts upon that assumption; and some writers upon elasticity profess to demonstrate that the forces between the parts of solids cannot be of that description. In reprinting his memoir, Helmholtz undertook to modify his expressions, so as to give room for the modern doctrine; but such modifications leave his arguments without much force, and deprive the theory itself of the greater part of its significance. It is on account of those observed facts about the elasticity of solids that Kelvin invariably expresses himself with reserve about molecules—saying that he believes that matter "has some kind of grained structure." It is not too much to say that this question is the principal question of to-day in natural philosophy. If central forces will suffice, so that the conservation of energy is to retain its full meaning, then the Boscovitchian conception (it ought not to be called a hypothesis) is the only rational way of thinking. But if central forces will not suffice, we are driven, it would appear, to conceive of matter as continuous, and therefore as a fluid in some respects homogeneous, throughout space. Thus we come to that order of ideas about media for the action of forces, the attraction of force-lines, etc., which have marked the physics of Great Britain since the time of Faraday. Here we find a rational motive for the vortex theory of atoms. Something of this great discussion might well have been allowed to appear in the introductory chapter of a work on the constitution of matter; but Mr. Risteen finds no place between his covers for any portion of it. Though he touches upon crystals, he never speaks of any doubts as to the sufficiency of central forces. He never mentions the name of Boscovitch. He speaks of the vortex theory, but does not show in what its real peculiarities consist, nor where the suggestion really came from.

The kinetical theory of gases, which now begins to take on the highest degree of certitude and something like completeness, is very well elucidated in Mr. Risteen's second chapter; yet we are amazed that the vast researches of Amagat should be passed by without mention (except that one constant is borrowed from him).

In the molecular theory of liquids nothing is said, either *pro* or *con*, in regard to the theorem of the virial of Clausius, which, it seems to us, ought to be the cynosure to guide our speculations upon this subject. In one passage we are said to be ignorant what the quadratic mean of the molecular translational velocities in a liquid may be at a given temperature; in another place it would seem to be assumed that the velocities in liquids and solids are less than in the gases of the same constitution at the same temperature. If the theorem of the virial is true, this question is easily answered; if it is not admitted, the objections to it ought to be stated. A strong attraction between the molecules of a liquid is manifest in its surface-tension, its heat of vaporization, etc. Its definite density is an effect of equilibrium between this attraction and the translational velocities of the molecules. It would thus seem to be evident that the velocities of molecules in the liquid cannot be less than they are in its saturated vapor above it. Mr. Risteen very promisingly commences an explanation of the incompressibility of liquids, by attributing it to the centrifugal force of the molecules. No doubt he is right, as far as he goes; but a more precise elucidation is desirable.

The molecular theory of solids appears to be beyond Mr. Risteen's present powers. At all events, he has not entered into the considerations which are prerequisite to any serious attempt at an outline explanation of the properties of these bodies.

In a chapter on the size of molecules, the author calls attention to the extreme vagueness of the idea of the size of a molecule. One might as well attempt to measure in inches the diameter of a crowd of people before a street show. It has no definite limits. We measure the length of a bar, because if we attempt to compress it we meet with a counter-pressure which, before we have sensibly reduced its length, exceeds any force we can bring to bear upon it. But it is not likely that molecules have this property to anything like the same degree. When we speak of their size we do not know what we mean; and one method of determination might perfectly well give one result, and another a widely different result, and yet both might, in their several senses, be correct. It is, therefore, a very remarkable fact that different calculations of the size of molecules based upon the most widely diverse considerations turn out to agree very well. Nobody ever supposed that in asking how large a molecule was, he was asking anything much more definite than if he had asked what the average size of an ordinary portable object is. The answer in the latter case might be, its size is somewhere from a fraction of an inch to a few yards. The size of molecules seems to be known quite as definitely. The diameter is somewhere about a ten-millionth or hundred-millionth of an inch.

A final chapter is devoted to speculations in regard to the constitution of molecules. Mr. Risteen defends very ingeniously the equation by which the number of "degrees of freedom" of a molecule is supposed to be determined. He has, on the whole, proved that he has the power to produce a treatise upon the subject adequate to the needs of students; and if the weak spots of his first essay receive the necessary attention, we may hope that a perfected edition will meet every desideratum.

Egyptian Decorative Art: A Course of Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution. By W. M. Flinders Petrie, D.C.L., Edwards Professor of Egyptology, University College, London. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1895. 12mo, pp. ix, 128.

PROFESSOR PETRIE is the most active popularizer of Egyptological subjects at the present time, and is, in this line, a worthy successor of the late Amelia B. Edwards, for whom his professorial chair is named. He lacks something of the literary charm which belonged to his patron, but the greater stores of his special and detailed knowledge make ample atonement in the mind of those who desire first hand facts more than figures of speech. His own diction, moreover, has often a personal and rugged character, resembling a natural conversational tone, which is not lacking in attractiveness.

Professor Petrie won his spurs as an explorer and excavator rather than as a professor, and has paid special attention to the forms of characters, signs, art-motives, and architectural designs, with a view to discovering their origin and genesis. We are all familiar with most of the artistic forms and devices portrayed by him in this volume, and the charm of his treatment is to be found in the tracing of artistic motives from their historical origination down through their successive stages of development and then into the art of other lands. This last is done to only a limited degree, yet sufficiently to show that a wide, varied, and interesting field is opened to view. The stages of decoration treated are the geometrical, the natural, the structural, and the symbolic. In each case the text is well illustrated with appropriate drawings taken from printed books, public and private collections, and from a fund of personal knowledge which has resulted from long-continued and varied observation at home and afield.

The office of the critic is very circumscribed in connection with the actual contents of such a work as this. It is the fruit of investigation in which the author stands well-nigh alone, and the reader must almost of necessity stand in the place of the learner. Nevertheless, the reader cannot but wish that the author had seen fit to go into greater detail at some points, and one feels sure that far more of fact and information might have been added had the call been made. Much of the information might be found scattered through other works, but that which is new is welcome and valuable. The principal difficulty is that the subject announced in the title is not exhausted, and more remains to be told than here comes to expression. For instance, a most interesting observation upon scarab decoration, made in the first volume of his 'History of Egypt' (p. 119), is not so much as mentioned, though it is one of the most suggestive that have been made in any book in recent times. One may therefore be justified in criticising the author for failing to take his task seriously enough, and for being satisfied to put forth a book that skims the surface, rather than a treatise. At the same time it must be acknowledged that Mr. Petrie was writing for popular reading rather than with the purpose of instructing specialists. Those to whom this is sufficient excuse may read the volume with profit and interest.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Ballantine, Prof. W. G. Inductive Logic. Boston: Ginn & Co. 90c.
Baring-Gould, S. Curiosities of Olden Times. Thomas Whittaker. $1.50.
Batten, Dr. J. M. Random Thoughts. Pittsburgh, Pa.: The Author.
Birchenough, Mrs. Disturbing Elements. Macmillan. $1 25
Book-Prices Current. Vol. IX. Dec., '94-Dec., '95. London: Elliot Stock.
Brooks, Sallie P. In Divers Paths. Hartford: Student Publishing Co.
Chambers, G. F. The Story of the Solar System. Appletons. 40c.
Conant, Prof. L. L The Number Concept: its Origin and Development. Macmillan.
Confessions of a Fool. G. W. Dillingham. 50c.
Cope, Prof. E. D. The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution. Chicago: *Open Court* Publishing Co. $2.
Crawford, F. M. A Tale of a Lonely Parish. Macmillan. 50c.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crawford, F. M. The Novel—What It Is. Macmillan. 25c.
Craddock, Florence N. The Twin Sisters. G. W. Dillingham. 50c.
Cunningham, Prof. W. Modern Civilization in Some of its Economic Aspects. London: Methuen & Co.
Defoe, Daniel. Robinson Crusoe. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 60c.
Dickens, Charles. A Tale of Two Cities, and Edwin Drood. Macmillan. $1.
Dombre, Roger. Tante Rabat-Joie. Paris: A. Colin & Cie.
Elistaetter, Karl. The Indian Silver Currency: An Historical and Economic Study. Chicago: University Press. $1.25.
Falkner, J. M. The Lost Stradivarius. Appletons. $1.
Fleming, George. For Plain Women Only. Merriam Co. $1.25.
Ferri, Prof. Enrico. Criminal Sociology. Appletons. $1.50.
Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger. A Dictionary of the English and German Languages. 2 vols. English-German; Deutsch-Englisch. Brunswick: George Westermann; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Fothergill, Caroline. The Comedy of Cecilia; or, An Honorable Man. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Garden and Forest. Vol. VIII. 1895. Garden and Forest Publishing Co
Gladstone, W. E. The Works of Joseph Butler. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $7.
Gidley, A. D. Socrates and Athenian Society in his Day. Macmillan. $1.75.
Gounod, C. F. Memoirs of an Artist. Rand, McNally & Co. $1.25.
Harper's Bazar. 1895. Vol. XXVIII. Harpers.
Harper's Monthly. 1895. 2 vols. Harpers.
Harper's Weekly. 1895. Vol. 39. Harpers.
Hicks, De F., and Remsen, H. R. Trinity Verse: A Second Compilation. Hartford, Conn.: Case, Lockwood & Brainard.
Hotchkiss, Louise S. Le Premier Livre de Français. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 40c
Housman, Laurence. The Were-Wolf. London: John Lane; Chicago: Way & Williams. $1.25.
Johnson, Capt. T. G. François-Séverin Marceau. 1769–1796. London: Bell; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Kinsley, W. W. Old Faiths and New Facts. Appletons. $1.50.
Molloy, J. F. An Excellent Knave. Lovell, Coryell & Co. 50c.
Nichols, E. L., and Franklin, W. S. The Elements of Physics: A College Text-Book. Vol. I. Mechanics and Heat. Macmillan. $1.50.
Nicoll, W. R., and Wise, T. J. Literary Anecdotes of the Nineteenth Century: Contributions towards a *Literary History of the Period.* London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. $8.
Paul, Prof. Hermann. Deutsches Wörterbuch. Erste Lieferung (A—Gebühr). Halle: Max Niemeyer; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Saltus, Edgar. Mary Magdalen. Lovell, Coryell & Co. 50c.
Schäfer, Prof. E. A., and Thane, Prof. G. D. Quain's Elements of Anatomy. 10th ed. Vol. III.—Part IV. Splanchnology. *Longmans, Green & Co.* $4.50.
Slatin, Pasha, R. C. Fire and Sword in the Soudan: A Personal Narrative of Fighting and Serving the Dervishes. Edward Arnold.
Smith, W. H. The Effects of the Gold Standard; or, Bimetallists' Catechism. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co. 25c.
Sound Currency. New York: Reform Club. $1.
Sully, Prof. James. Studies of Childhood. Appletons. $2.50.
Triggs, O. L. Lydgate's Assembly of the Gods. [English Studies.] Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Vickers, B. H. America Liberata. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co. 50c.
Wiseman, Cardinal. Fabiola; or, The Church of the Catacombs. Illustrated edition. Benziger Bros.

KERNER'S NATURAL HISTORY OF PLANTS.

With 1,000 cuts and 16 colored plates. Four parts; 4to, cloth, $15.00 *net.*

"A most fascinating book, not only for the botanist but for the general reader."—Prof. J. M. COULTER in the *Dial.*

"Not only will it introduce the non-botanical reader to the science of botany, but should serve as a lesson to the professional botanist in the art of presentation."—*Botanical Gazette.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

NOW READY.

Pagan Ireland:

An Archæological Sketch.

A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Antiquities. By W. G. WOOD-MARTIN, M.R.I.A., author of "The Lake Dwellings of Ireland," etc. With over 400 Illustrations, Bibliography, and Index. 8vo, cloth, pp. xxvii+689, $5.00.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,

91-93 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Do me the favor to ask your wine-merchant, or Park & Tilford (wholesale agents), for my "*Picarillo*" natural sherry, and "*Manzanilla Pasada.*"

GUILLERMO DOBLACHE,
Puerto de Santa Maria.

Selections from Vergil's Georgics,

Edited for Sight-Reading by J. RAMSEN BISHOP, may be obtained from

THE ROBT. CLARKE CO., Cincinnati.

Single copies, 25 cents; 10 or more, 20 cents each.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLS., AND SETS of the *Nation*, as also of all periodicals, bought, sold, and exchanged by A. S. CLARK, 174 Fulton Street, west of Broadway, New York.

BACK numbers and sets of all magazines. For price state wants to AMERICAN MAGAZINE EXCHANGE, De Menil Building, St. Louis, Mo.

H. WILLIAMS, 25 EAST 10TH ST., N.Y., dealer in Magazines and other Periodicals. Sets, volumes, or single numbers.

Books of To-day and 'Belinda' Suppt.

The Best Monthly Review of English Books for American Readers.

Annual Subscription 3s. 6d., post free.

HATCHARDS,

Booksellers to the Queen,

187 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

FRENCH BOOKS.

MEYER BROS. & CO.,

1127 Broadway, bet. 25th and 26th Sts., N.Y.

French Books, Photographs, School Books, Newspapers.

Send for Catalogues. Also our monthly French publication, *L'Echo de France*, giving reviews and list of all French Books. Sample copy *free!*

ELLIS & ELVEY,

Dealers in Old and Rare Books.

CATALOGUES OF CHOICE BOOKS AND ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS published periodically.

Rare Early English Literature, Early Printed Books in Black-Letter, Ancient Artistic Bookbindings, rare Prints and Autographs, etc. Only fine specimens are dealt with.

29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

MAYER & MÜLLER, Booksellers.

51 Markgrafenst., Berlin (Germany).

Direct supply, at best terms, of GERMAN NEW AND SECOND-HAND BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, and PERIODICALS in any department of Learning and Literature. *Cheapest opportunity* for Libraries, Professors, and Students. Catalogues on application. Best references.

C. A. KOEHLER & CO., 149a Tremont St. (Lawrence Building, Corner West St.). BOSTON MASS. **FOREIGN BOOKS** Importations from Europe. Catalogues on application.

Foreign Books. Subscriptions to Foreign Periodicals. *Tauchnitz* British authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 23 School St., Boston.

Complete Index to Littell's Living Age, to the end of 1895. E. ROTH, 1135 Pine St., Phila.

LEMCKE & BUECHNER,

Formerly B. Westermann & Co.,

812 Broadway, ... New York.

Will publish immediately:

Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger,

School and Hand Lexicon of the German and English Languages.

2 vols., large 8vo, half leather, $4.50.

The German-English part separately $2.60, the long-expected smaller edition of Flügel's 3 vol. Dictionary, half morocco, $16.50.

ROMANS CHOISIS

FRENCH BOOKS.—A series, pure, of high literary value and representative of the authors; printed in large type on good paper. Price, cloth, 85c; paper, 60c.

No. 21. **NANON. By George Sand.** 431 pages
No. 22. **LE PETIT CHOSE. By Alphonse Daudet.**
No. 23. **LE PECHEUR D'ISLANDE. By Pierre Loti.** Arranged by the author himself.

THE SERIES WILL BE CONTINUED WITH STORIES OF OTHER WELL-KNOWN WRITERS.

Complete catalogue on application. For sale by all booksellers, or postpaid on receipt of price by the *publisher,*

WILLIAM R. JENKINS,

851 and 853 Sixth Ave. (48th St.), New York.

LIBRARIES

Supplying Private and Public Libraries with Books our **SPECIALTY.** A List of standard and new issues of all publishers *mailed on request.* Lists priced gratis. Test our figures.

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.,

WHOLESALE BOOKS,

5 and 7 East Sixteenth St., New York.

A NEW ERA IN BOOKSELLING.

BRENTANO'S, 31 Union Square, announce an important change of policy. Hereafter they will sell books at SWEEPING REDUCTIONS from PUBLISHERS' PRICE. Bookbuyers will thus be afforded the opportunity to purchase from an unrivalled stock of Classic, Standard, and Current Literature, at PRICES as LOW as prevail ANYWHERE, with the added advantage of prompt and intelligent service.

ALL the BOOKS of THE DAY at LOWEST PRICES. Foreign Books.

Mail orders receive special attention.

Send for Brentano's Monthly List of New Books. Free on application.

BRENTANO'S,
Publishers, Booksellers, Stationers, Newsdealers,
31 Union Square, New York.

F. W. CHRISTERN

(DYRSEN & PFEIFFER, Suc'rs),

254 Fifth Ave., between 28th and 29th Sts., New York,

Importers of Foreign Books; Agents for the leading Paris Publishers; Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. New books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

YALE MIXTURE.

The choicest tobacco made, and pre-eminently a gentleman's smoke.

Marburg Bros., The American Tobacco Co., Successor, Baltimore, Md

GOLDEN SCEPTRE.

PERFECTION FOR THE PIPE.

Send 40 cents for 4-oz. sample to

SURBRUG, 159 Fulton St., N. Y. City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED